

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN
THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND
WITNESSED FOR BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

EDITED BY C. WEBSTER,
Pastor of the First Associate Congregation, Philadelphia.

VOLUME XVI.

Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.—*Jer.* vi. 16.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM S. YOUNG,
173, RACE STREET.

1839-40.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JANUARY, 1840.

ART. I.—SCHISMATICS.—*The Notes of a Sermon transcribed for the Religious Monitor, at the request of some who heard it preached.*

Rom. xvi. 18. "For they that are such, serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple."

THE sin and danger of divisions and offences in the church, and the importance and necessity of unanimity, had been much insisted on in preceding parts of this epistle. (Chap. xii. 5, 6.) Our Lord Jesus Christ, the great Prophet of the church, declared there would be offences, and indeed, that there *would be need* for them; at the same time also, he pronounced a wo on the world on account of them; but especially on the individual by whom they should come. (Matth. xviii. 7, and Luke xvii. 1.) What this *need* is, and the design of Providence in permitting them, seem to be pointed out, Cor. xi. 19—"That they that are approved may be made manifest." But this does not lessen the sin in those who are either the authors or abettors of them; nor does it diminish the vigilance, which it is the duty of the church and her friends to exercise, in guarding against them. In the preceding verse, the apostle has laid down a most effectual rule for preventing divisions and offences in the church, and guarding against their evil consequences, viz. "Mark and avoid those who cause them." This rule, if properly observed, would never fail of remedying the evil. It is the result of infinite Wisdom. Human wisdom can never devise a better. [For a discourse on this subject, see R. Monitor, August, 1830.]

In our text the apostle gives a description or some distinguishing marks of those who cause divisions and offences in the church, so that the church and those who love the peace and the prosperity of Zion, may the more readily recognise them, in order that they may be marked and avoided, and that their baleful influence and mischief may be the more successfully opposed. For let it be remembered, that it is not merely the doctrine and practical conduct of such that are to be marked and avoided—but the individuals or persons themselves, as Dr. Scott justly remarks, "as persons infected with a contagious disease."

Before entering on the main scope of the passage, we must premise a remark or two. 1. The divisions which take place in the church, and the offences or stumbling-blocks which are laid in the way of the simple, are in almost all cases to be ascribed to those within the church, and most generally to her public teachers. Some shall come into the church for the very purpose of dividing and destroying her. "For I know," says the apostle, "after my departure, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." (Acts xx. 30.) And again, (Gal. ii. 4.) he speaks of "False brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage." But, alas! the authorship of these evils is not confined only to such. How often do we find the offspring of the church, the children born within her pale, and brought up on her own knees, among the number of her troublers! "Also, of your own selves," says Paul to the elders of Ephesus, "shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts xx. 30.) The tendency of opposition from without, is to make the church more united; but that from within, rends and divides. 2. The success of such is not always confined to those of like minds with themselves—they too often "deceive the hearts of the simple." The term *simple* is here used in its primitive signification. "For one," says Cruden, "who is harmless, innocent, and free from deceit." Such are most easily deceived with the smooth words and fair pretences of false and deceitful men. "The simple believeth every word." (Prov. xiv. 15.) Being free from guile themselves, they are not aware of the snares which are laid for them by the crafty and deceitful. By the good words and fair speeches of the persons described in our text, their *hearts* are deceived, their affections are beguiled, before they are aware of the wickedness and deception practised upon them. But to proceed with the main design of our text—the description of those who cause divisions and offences in the church.

The description here given by the apostle may be considered under two general heads.

II. They are described by the end or object they have in view—to serve their own carnal purposes. This object is set forth in a two-fold view.

First. Negatively. "It was not to serve the Lord Jesus Christ." This is mentioned to show what the great and only chief object of all who make a profession of religion should be; and this is the main object of every true disciple. It may appear strange that any should desire to enter the church of Christ, and especially the ministry, with any but pure motives. But it is lamentably true, many do. Judas became a disciple, probably with no other design, on his part, than that he might carry the bag, (John xii. 6.) and indulge more successfully his covetous and avaricious spirit.

Some think they can serve the Lord Jesus Christ and their own belly, or their carnal purposes, both at the same time. But our Lord has declared, no man can serve two masters at once. (Matth. vi. 24.) Others think, they can more effectually gain the latter object by professing the former. They profess to serve Christ in order to accomplish their carnal purposes. Simon the sorcerer desired to be a

disciple that he might have the gift of working miracles and conferring the Holy Ghost by the imposition of his hands, in order that he might sustain the reputation of being some great one, of which he seemed most ambitious. (John viii. S.) And others again, with the very design of destroying the church and the cause of Christ. Thus the Cuthean Samaritans professed to seek and serve the God of Israel, and wished to join with Ezra and Nehemiah and the other children of Judah and Benjamin in re-building the temple unto the Lord God of Israel. (Ezra iv. 2.)

But the apostle here seems particularly to intend such as profess to serve Christ, and under pretence of serving him, gain admission into the church and into the ministry, while in reality they are not serving him at all, but some selfish and carnal purpose.

1. Such as make a profession and labour in the ministry with great zeal and industry, to gain the applause and admiration of men, do not serve Christ. "If I pleased men," says Paul, "I should not be the servant of Christ." (Gal. i. 16.)

2. Such as labour to serve a sect or party in the church, or to build up a particular sect or denomination, merely because they belonged to it, are not serving Christ. Many may, and it is to be feared do, labour with zeal and industry with no higher object. The Pharisees would compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when they had proselyted him, he was twofold more the child of hell than themselves. (Matth. xxiii. 15.) Surely this was not serving Christ or his cause.

3. With the same class may be ranked such as will creep, or insinuate themselves into houses, to lead away and beguile the unwary and the weak. (2 Tim. iii. 6.)

4. Some of the same class are found even to preach Christ; but it is that they may more effectually "deceive the hearts of the simple;" or "out of envy and strife." (Philip. i. 15, 16.)

5. Those also seem especially intended, who are "ambitious of being at the head of a party in the church," or to give name to some sect, and in order to accomplish this purpose, "will speak perverse things, that they may draw away disciples after them." Acts xx. 30.)

Lastly. They do not serve Christ who follow, aid, countenance, or encourage such as cause divisions and offences in the church, according to the rule that he that biddeth God speed, or countenanceth another, in an evil thing, makes himself a partaker in the sin, and is equally guilty in the sight of God. (2 John, 10, 11.) The same rule is recognised with respect to another class of immoralities, "He that takes pleasure in those that do them," is classed with the perpetrator of the crime. Rom. i. 32. In this way many may ignorantly involve themselves in the greatest sins.

Second. Affirmatively. "To serve their own belly." A low object, truly. The term *belly* here, may be understood to include any carnal, gross, worldly, or sensual desire. Those who mind earthly things chiefly, who make their profession of religion and attention to moral duties subservient to the gratification of sensual and carnal propensities, are said to make a god of their belly. (Philip. iii. 19.) False prophets and false teachers, by whom "the way of truth is evil spoken of," are charged "with making merchandise of men through covetousness." (2 Pet. ii. 1, 3.) Such are enemies of the cross of Christ, and their end is destruction.

1. Some make religion and the office of the holy ministry the means of gratifying a pampered appetite. They profess the one and serve in the other, in order to live in ease and luxury; for in some places and in some ages, the office of the ministry has been subservient to these objects. Thus it was with the sons of Eli. 1 Sam. ii. 12, 16. This has most frequently been the case when the civil and religious influence were united.

2. Others serve a carnal appetite, who, like the dishonest but sagacious steward, could not or would not dig, and was ashamed to beg directly, will either make a profession of religion or aspire to the office of the ministry, with no higher object than to gain a living in this world. It was declared, concerning the posterity of Eli, that they should beg to be put into the priest's office, that they might eat a piece of bread. 1 Sam. ii. 36. Such will cling to the office for sake of its emoluments, after they have forfeited and lost their right to perform its duties. There is no motive for which persons may enter the ministerial office, more pointedly condemned, than that of gain. "A bishop must not be greedy of filthy lucre." (1 Tim. iii. 3.) "A bishop must not be given to filthy lucre." And again—"There are many unruly [persons who will not submit to the necessary and wholesome rules of church discipline,] and vain talkers and deceivers—whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." (Tit. i. 7, 11.) (See also 1 Pet. v. 2.) These repeated and strong warnings against it, would not have been given, if this were not an object for entering on and continuing the exercise of the ministry. How unlike him who laboured night and day without having where to lay his head, and finally suffered on the cross for the salvation of souls!

"There are 'greedy dogs' as well as 'dumb dogs.'" (See Isa. lvi. 11, 12, and Mic. iii. 11.) -

3. Such is the object of those who assume to themselves the administration of divine ordinances contrary to the rules of Christ's house, and profane or pollute them. Such were the prophets reprobated by the message of the prophet Ezekiel, (chap. xiii. 19.) "And will ye pollute me among my people, for handfuls of barley and pieces of bread?" saith JEHOVAH.

II. Those who cause divisions and offences in the church, and who ought to be marked and avoided, are farther described in our text by the means which they practise to accomplish their object, viz.—*by deceiving the people by good words and fair speeches.*

We have seen what is the grand and ultimate end or object of such—to serve their own carnal purposes, but a subordinate end is necessary to the accomplishing of this main end; *the people must be deceived.* If their true character were manifest they could not "serve their own belly," because they could not "lead away disciples after them." Our inquiry now is, how do they avail themselves of these means to accomplish their main object? We answer:

1. By flattering those who hear or employ them. Thus did Ahab's prophets flatter him to his own destruction. (2 Chron. xviii. 5, 12, 27.) And Micah, the Lord's prophet, because he told the truth, was treated as an enemy. "Am I, therefore, become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" (Gal. iv. 16.) Such also are the prophets who speak smooth things and prophesy deceits. (Isa. xxx. 10, 11.)

2. By promising peace to their followers in pursuing wicked and divisive courses. (Jer. xiii. 16, 17.) "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Harken not unto the words of the prophets, that prophesy unto you: they make you vain: they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord. They say still unto them that despiseth me, * The Lord hath said, Ye shall have peace, and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come upon you." They do not censure for immorality. (See also Jer. viii. 10, 11, and xxviii. 1, 4, 15, 17, and Ezek. xiii. 16.) Such hold out to their deluded followers prospects of peace, while they are causing them to trust in a lie. They induce them to believe that their troubles will be settled and their conduct approved, until they have led them so far out of the way of rectitude, that they do not fear their returning to it. And while they are crying peace to the people, they themselves will be biting with the teeth of malice and slander. (Mic. iii. 5.)

3. They deceive the simple, by assuming the appearance of meekness, piety, and love. Outwardly they appear in sheep's clothing, while inwardly they are ravening wolves. (Mat. vii. 15, 21.) They do this with so much art and address that they would deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. (Mat. vii. 24.) Such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light: therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works. (2 Cor. xi. 14, 15.) They will make long prayers. (Mat. xxiii. 14.)

4. Such study to suit themselves to the temper and spirit of those whom they wish to deceive. Do they find any weary of the restraint which the discipline of the church imposes, like Absalom they are ready to promise a remedy if they will only follow them. Do they find any ambitious of distinction and office in the church, they will show them that their prospects are with them, and thus lead away disciples after them. (Acts xx. 30.)

IMPROVEMENT.—1. From this subject we may learn that it is the duty of all to *serve Christ*. Col. iii. 24. "Ye serve the Lord Christ."

2. That the enemies of religion often profess it, and desire to take part with its friends, and creep into the ministry, in order that they may the more effectually oppose it, or serve themselves by it. (Ezra iv. 2. Acts xx. 3, 8.)

3. That to promote or encourage divisions in the church of Christ, is a great and most aggravated sin. Such take the side of Satan in the great controversy. (Mat. xi. 25. Mark iii. 25—ix. 45.)

4. That "good words and fair speeches," are the usual means to which schismatics resort to carry on their evil purposes against the church of Christ, and especially when their design is to serve themselves.

5. Let every individual for himself see that he is not among those who are deceived or led away by such as cause divisions and

* Jehovah is despised when the ordinance of discipline in his house is despised and contemned. He that despiseth an ordinance despiseth the author of it.

offences. For those who countenance or encourage them, make themselves partakers of their evil deeds. (2 John 10, 11.)

6. Learn the end of such, and in order to avoid it, avoid them. "For many walk of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; *whose end is destruction*, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things. (Phil. iii. 19.)

Thus, my brethren, I have attempted to set before you a plain, but scriptural warning against an evil and a danger to which the church, in all ages, has been exposed. And if you have to pass through a trial in this respect, think not that some strange or new thing has happened to you. The church, in all ages, has been similarly tried. But betake yourselves to Christ, her Head. He that keeps Israel, slumbers not nor sleeps—He is almighty. Hence, no weapon formed against Zion can prosper. The "good words and fair speeches," of Zion's most persevering enemies are as easily defeated by Him, whose name is "Wonderful, Counsellor," as any other weapon they can form. Commit her cause, then, to Him. Fly to Him yourselves for protection in a day of rebuke and dismay. He is not only "The Rock of ages, on which His church is founded, but he is also the Shadow of a Great Rock in a weary land. In Him, then, and in Him alone, you are safe. Amen.

ART. II.—*Societyism.*

MR. EDITOR—I observe in your October number "Queries respecting voluntary associations," and the remarks under this head, containing a sweeping denunciation. When I read the article, I felt inclined to *show mine opinion*, but ere this reach you, it is probable some of your able correspondents will step in to the satisfaction of the querist and other readers. A mere sketch is all that time and circumstances will permit. To survey the whole field is beyond my capacity, having no proper knowledge of many of the societies named, and the practical operations of others more familiar in name, lie out of my view; I shall, therefore, confine my very brief remarks to the principle of societyism and the comparative injury and benefits of a very few of those societies named.

I would premise, that where an accusation is brought against an individual or society, the burden of proof lies upon the accuser, and the accused should be deemed innocent until full proof is made. In the present case, it is enough for societies to plead not guilty to the charge of unscriptural conduct. If there is evidence in the affirmative, let it be shown. If the 106th Ps. is relied on for proof, I doubt its application, unless there is a mingling in something sinful, as was evidently the case in the history referred to. I cannot, therefore, see that this is proof in point to condemn the general principle. But if it is intended to apply to particular cases in practice, it is admitted in all its force. The Masonic society, for example, is morally and radically wrong in its origin, profane, and even blasphemous in its exercises, and most deleterious in all its consequences; never doing good, *but evil—only evil, and that continually*. Now all this admitted in practice, still the question of principle remains unsettled.

I take the position, that whatever is morally right for an individual to do, may be lawfully done by a society, when the articles of association, and the practice under them, are consonant to the divine law. Let it not be said that this is begging the question; for the question before us respects not the goodness of the articles, nor the practice under them; but whether it is lawful to form a voluntary association of any kind. It is a Bible precept to *do good to all men*; but all the ways in which this good may be done are not specified. Something, then, seems left to human prudence within the bounds of the moral law. If, in compliance with this precept, we associate in order to do good more extensively, for "in union there is strength," and yet violate no moral precept, where can lie the evil?

Some years since, female benevolent societies were common in the Secession church. They associated for the purpose of raising funds to defray the expenses of missionaries from the Associate church in Scotland, or to aid in the education of young men preparing for the gospel ministry in this country. Some, but *not all*, belonged to the Secession church. They met—had prayers, and, *as iron sharpeneth iron*, so their countenances encouraged each other. Their contributions went into the synod's funds, for which thanks were voted by the synod, as their minutes show; and the writer knows, that from one congregation alone, there went into the synod's funds, from this source, some two or three hundred dollars. And I appeal to the most strict observer of Providence, if ever there was a time of greater *peace and prosperity* in the Secession church, than when she had the prayers and contributions of those pious females. This example is given as an argument in favour of the principle of voluntary associations, and so far as human authority is good evidence, here is the testimony of the whole synod of North America. If that synod could see nothing unscriptural in all this, no wonder that I cannot.

The next point is the comparative benefit and injury arising from the practice of voluntary associations. I begin with the female societies above named, and I hazard the opinion without reserve, that much good and no evil was the result of the labours of those associations.

With respect to Bible societies in general, I would say, they do good by circulating a correct and authorized translation; but they err by circulating such as are not duly authorized. To the church is committed the oracles of God, and the church is the proper judge of translations—the word of the Lord should *go forth from Jerusalem*. In particular, the American Bible Society erred greatly, when the board decided that it would be unconstitutional to publish Bibles with the Psalms in metre, inasmuch as a metrical translation of the Psalms might be considered of the nature of a comment on the holy scriptures. These were about their own words, and as we pass, it was a dereliction of principle, for Seceders, at least, to acquiesce in such a sentiment; yet it is true, that many of them did so, by continuing members, to the neglect of judicious regulations, made by the synod of their own church, to furnish the very article requested of the American board, that is, the scripture Psalms in metre.

All missionary societies formed in the common way, who commission and send forth preachers, err, in that they usurp the authority of the church. This should be done by the *laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*.

The writer was once a zealous labourer in the Colonization Society, but he now entertains serious doubts, whether upon the whole it ever did any good; and he is now firmly of opinion, that at present, it is doing serious injury—as it lulls the consciences of many asleep, both in the slave states and the free, and rivets the chains of the oppressed. It furnishes a retreat for time-serving ministers and other such professors of religion.

With respect to anti-slavery societies in Europe, little can be said. I know they exist in France, in Hayti, (in Upper Canada, British America.) I will not be confident, but am under the impression that they existed in England at the time the slave trade was abolished; but it is well known that they were very numerous there, and the grand means of abolishing slavery in the West Indies, where the condition of hundreds of thousands was changed from that of slaves to free men in one day—no longer considered goods and chattels, but rational creatures, with liberty to worship and serve their Maker according to His revealed will. Every man allowed to have *his own wife, and every wife her own husband*, and the parents at liberty to *bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*. What an important change! In all this, I can perceive no injury, but incalculable good.

Is it possible to discover any injury done to New York or Pennsylvania, when slavery was abolished there, by means of anti-slavery societies; but who is so blind as not to see the immense good accomplished? One of those societies flourished as early as 1785. "John Jay the first, and Alexander Hamilton the second president." Another in 1789, Dr. Franklin, president, Dr. Rush, secretary. Thus, men of that day, most renowned for wisdom, were not ashamed to be found at the head of institutions, now looked upon by many as odious, and the morality of their formation questioned. Then it was honourable, now it is odious. Then secretary Rush could act unmolested at Philadelphia, now secretary Lovejoy can be murdered with impunity by a mob at Alton. It is impossible to account for this difference of circumstances in any other way, than the increasing influence of slavery, and a prejudice as inveterate as it is unwarrantable.

As to the vast number of anti-slavery societies now in the full tide of experiment in this country, it is impossible to say how their labours may terminate; but the path of duty is clear; let them persevere and trust to Providence for a favourable result. They may be the *occasion*, but not the *cause* of excitement. Reproof of sin and attempts at reformation, have in all ages occasioned excitement; but this was no reason why the apostles should quit preaching the gospel of salvation to perishing sinners. Neither is it a reason why abolitionists should cease their exertions to save the nation from impending and awful calamities. The fruits of long anti-slavery labours in the West Indies were at last realized in one glorious harvest day. So Americans must toil and sweat, waiting in hopes of a like happy issue.

The very discussion of the subject is doing good—as for injury, I can discover none. To charge the mobocratic outrages of our day upon abolitionists, would be as unjust as to charge like conduct upon the prophets and apostles, so common in their day; for in all ages there are *lewd fellows of the baser sort*.

I cannot quite agree with the “Querist,” that those societies are “irresponsible to either church or state.” Individuals are held responsible for every transgression of law, either of the church or state, according to the capacity in which they act, and cognizance taken accordingly. But if there is no transgression of law, there can be no sin.

It is thought the church is every thing, and all that is necessary for moral reform. Be it so for the present—it is not intended to take any thing out of the hands of the church, but to aid in reformation. If the church, in all her branches, would show herself *fair as the moon—clear as the sun*, she would be *terrible as an army with banners*. But when most of her ministers never open their mouths respecting the most crying sin of the land, unless it be to extenuate or defend it, what can be expected from that source of reformation? Is it not strange that the church has to be stimulated to duty by the world, that abounding sin may be abolished? It is a lamentable truth, that the church and the free states sustain slavery!

It is, in many respects, a low time in Zion—Ichabod seems written on all the posts and pillars of the temple. It is a time calling for the earnest prayers of all, that the God of Zion would return in mercy and build up her broken down walls, and repair her desolations—and this is the desire of

A WESTERN CITIZEN.

ART. III.—*Farther Remarks on the Treatment of our Coloured Population.*

MR. EDITOR—Attention to pressing and necessary avocations has prevented me from pursuing my remarks on the treatment of our coloured population, as speedily as I desired. I shall now attempt, without farther delay, to bring the subject to a close. But before entering upon it, you will pardon me for making a few explanatory and other observations. This is a duty which appears to be imperiously imposed upon me, as the purity of my motives seems to have been called in question, and yourself and others think that I have manifested “temper” in my answer to Logan’s Interrogatories. If it be true, that while reproving others for indulging an imbittered spirit, I myself, before the lines were dry, or the traces erased from the tablet of my memory, was guilty of the fault reproved, it places me in no enviable attitude.

Why is it that we are so sensitive? Why is it that intolerance, like a noisome pestilence, is sweeping over our land, and desolating, and laying waste all our social relations? Is it not a fearful token that we are not sound in our social constitutions? The man who is hale and healthy in body, who is buoyant in spirit, and unsuspecting in temper, will bear much rough handling without betraying uneasiness; while, on the contrary, he who is covered with bruises,

biles, and ulcers, and whose temper is soured by indulging a fretful disposition, will scarcely suffer you to lay your finger upon him without writhing in agony. Amidst such intolerance, it was truly with a grateful heart that I cast my eye over your observations in the September Number. They were, indeed, an oasis in the desert, a verdant spot cheering to the pilgrim in his weary journey. How gladdening to see men, who by their talents and stations, are qualified to influence public sentiment, manifesting the liberality of the philanthropist and the meekness of the Christian. It is true, you smite me, and although I am not conscious that I deserve it, yet for your kindness I thank you cordially. Such smiting will not break my head. Reprove a wise man, and he will love you. Open rebuke is better than secret love. I have said that I am not conscious that I deserve your rebuke, but shall endeavour to profit by it, in the way of using vigilance and caution for the future, lest I offend.

Your friend thinks I manifest "temper." All I can positively say is, that I am not conscious of ever having entertained a hard thought, or indulged an unkind feeling toward Logan or any one else. True, I must acknowledge, that, like other sinful men, I am surrounded with infirmities. I find a law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and it is possible that an ardent constitutional temperament may have caused me to speak unadvisedly with my lips; but the idea of giving personal offence was not within the range of my thoughts. Truth has claims which are paramount to all others; but it does not require us to sacrifice the charities of social life. He who does not enter on its defence with all the ardour of his soul; he who will not use "words that glow," may not expect to enjoy "thoughts that burn." Every one accustomed to write or speak, knows that if a writer or speaker labours under a continued effort to repress the energy of his language, he will almost infallibly be visited with poverty of conception. Such is the construction of our minds—such the connexion of our ideas, that one train of thought flows as if these ideas were united by the ties of a common relationship; and he who plods upon the earth when he could soar above the clouds, is unfaithful to his trust. In religious controversy, as in all others, we ought to presume, that truth appears to our opponents in all the beauty, in all the strength, in all the loveliness that it does to ourselves, and is as capable of enlisting their understandings and engaging their hearts, as our own. How unreasonable, then, to object to the ardent zeal of those who are opposed to us when there is nothing disrespectful in their language.*

* There is much truth in these remarks, and readers should learn equally with writers to distinguish between bitterness of spirit and personal invective, and ardent zeal in the cause of truth. Some latitude of expression must be allowed. No man ever produced any thing worth reading while constantly trammelled with the fear that some word, which he deemed suitable to his subject, might be construed as too strong; unless writing rules of grammar for school boys, or some similar production. If the world impeaches the motives of Christians, it cannot be expected that it will admire their language. On this point, we have two classes of complainants: 1. Those who hate the meaning couched in strong expressions. 2. Those who like the meaning, but have fears that the manner will injure the cause. This class is in danger of paying too much deference to the enemies of the truth. A soft manner mingled with flattery may make hypocrites, not Christians. God's people, who love the truth, are not offended when it is maintained by the use of the strongest terms known to the English language, provided they breathe a Christian spirit—ED. REL. MON.

Did I do injustice to Logan by misapprehending his meaning? I certainly understood from his "interrogatories," that he admitted that the Jews were authorized by the Divine law, to buy persons of the heathen, and hold them in involuntary servitude. Now, the question was, do we not disparage the Divine law, by insisting that such buying and holding are essentially sinful? I was led to put this construction on his language, not only by what appeared to be its simple import, but by that ceaseless effort which is made in some quarters to impress upon the mind a belief that the Mosaic dispensation was not only comparatively dark, but that it sanctioned the doing of things that were cruel and unjust. Whatever may have been the poverty of my reply, in point of argument, if my view of Logan's question was not altogether erroneous, I put it to the candid to say whether they will pronounce my language too severe. Be this as it may, it was no ground of offence to my opponent. If I palpably misunderstood and put an unwarrantable meaning upon what he said, it was a good reason why I myself should stand abashed before an intelligent and sober community; but none that he should be offended.

I do hope that Logan will consider these matters more dispassionately than he appears to have done hitherto; for I do most solemnly declare, that my object is not a triumph over him, or any one else, much less a triumph obtained at the expense of truth. And here, I trust, he will pardon me for directing him to a point where he has evidently wronged himself. He asks why I complain of *misrepresentation*, when he quotes my very words, and then sets down as my words, "I am willing to see a person enslaved." To this I have two remarks to make. In the first place, I have complained little, and never have I spoken of misrepresentation, nor have I used any word which I supposed could, by any possibility, be tortured into an impeachment of the integrity, or understanding of those opposed to me in sentiment. In the second place—does not every body know, that we may quote an author's very words, and make him utter sentiments, not only contrary to those which he entertains, but to those which he has expressed. If I assert that I would be willing to see a person enslaved, rather than to see him put to a painful, lingering death, does another represent me fairly, when he leaves out the conditional part of the proposition? He cannot do so, unless the putting of a person to a painful, lingering death be regarded as a circumstance of no consequence. Here let me refer to a case which I presume has escaped the notice of few persons. The Bible says, in so many words, "There is no God." These are its very words. Now does the Bible teach the doctrine, that there is no God? It is just as certain, that the Bible teaches the doctrine, that there is no God, as that I have expressed a willingness to see a person enslaved.

Before I quit this subject, let me drop a hint to Logan, and to all others who may be disposed to put questions to people in a public manner on matters of general interest. It ought to be universally known, that this practice is not regarded as altogether respectful. The reason of this is obvious. It is not pleasant to be subjected to a teasing process, by the malignant or the curious, or even by the honest inquirer. When men choose to come before the public with

their reflections, they wish not only to select a subject, but wish to treat it in reference to particular results. Now, if it be courteous to interrogate men in a general way, it must be discourteous to refuse to answer. The consequence would be obvious. A person would be compelled to discuss subjects, which he, perhaps, had not examined very minutely, or be guilty of a breach of good manners. I might remark, that it is agreed on all hands, that there is no way in which a man is more likely to be entrapped in the snare of an artful antagonist, than by answering questions.

It is truly mortifying, that any thing should have taken place to render the declaration necessary on your part, that you would not suffer correspondents to abuse each other. I hope I shall be pardoned, situated as I am, for making a few general observations on this point, without excusing myself or implicating others.

What is the sum and substance of all that vituperation and abuse which religious controversialists of every grade and complexion are daily pouring on each others' heads? It is according to the interpretation of the Divine oracles, and in sacred language, summed up in two short words—Thou fool—thou hypocrite. The fool says in his heart, There is no God. The hypocrite professes to believe in God, but he serves him not. The first is wrong in head, the latter wrong in heart. Of the first it is said, "Fools shall not stand in his sight," and of the latter, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell!" What awful language! and with what terrible majesty and authority is it spoken! What is the sentence pronounced on that mortal who usurps God's throne, judging the hearts and condemning the persons with whom he is associated? "But whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." It would be consummate folly to attempt to add either force or perspicuity to such clear and emphatic declarations.

That the use of such language is impolitic, is equally as demonstrable as that it is awfully sinful. Does truth stand in need of such a defence? When we resort to the use of weapons which are clearly forbidden, may it not be naturally presumed that we are in possession of none that are lawful? Is it not an insult to our sense of natural justice, when we see a man act as prosecutor, as witness, as juror, and as judge in condemning those accused of crime? Is it not equally offensive to our sense of moral justice, when we see men instituting a court of conscience in their own bosoms, arraigning the motives and intentions of those around them, and pronouncing a sentence of condemnation against them? If we be in possession of facts, which we think the world should know, duty may require us to make them public, together with the evidence which proves them; but when it is clear that we are a party interested, nothing can exceed our folly when we proceed to condemnation. Whose prerogative is it to search the heart? "I, the Lord, search the heart, I try the reins, even to give to every man according to his way, and according to the fruit of his doings."

You think I would promote the interest of your periodical by dropping the controverted point. Your will shall be law to me on that point, so far as the nature of the case will admit.* I have

* We did not intend to restrict our correspondent. Our remark was offered as a suggestion.

heretofore only mentioned it incidentally as connected with the main business on hand, and it is perhaps not possible to inquire what is duty with respect to slavery, without adverting to it more or less directly. We are told that the relation of master is, in its nature, as sinful as living with a woman in a state of adultery, and that an entire separation is as necessary in the one case as in the other. Indeed, if the absolute sinfulness of slavery be admitted, I see not how the other consequence can be avoided. This, you at once will perceive, precludes all argument or inquiry on the subject, except what may relate to the most eligible mode of effecting the separation of the parties. If we tell them that the slave cannot be released from the fetters that bind him, except by the action of the commonwealth, that he can no more act as a freeman, and stipulate for wages, and recover his dues if he engage in commerce with a stranger, than he can with his master, still we are told the relation is sinful and must be dissolved, that duty is ours, and that consequences must be left to God.

I am at a loss to account for the sensitiveness which exists on this point. It would be ungenerous to attribute it to conscious weakness, and yet it is hardly compatible with that calm dispassionate composure, which entire confidence is sure to inspire. That people, who deem their property, their safety, and all that they hold dear, to be in danger, should, in such discussions, be tremulously alive, is not surprising, nor is it altogether unaccountable, that those who have imbibed strong prejudices against the coloured race, should rail out against the idea of mingling with them; but why people cannot discuss an abstract question which does not necessarily involve any of these consequences, nor any others connected with our interests, our prejudices, or our passions, is passing strange. It will not do to say it is a vital point as connected with the purity of the church and personal holiness. If it be so, such offenders ought to be expostulated with in all meekness, soberness, and firmness, and if found obstinate, the censures of the church ought to be inflicted on them. Be this as it may, it ought to be the desire of Christians who profess to walk together, to become thoroughly acquainted with each others' sentiments—for "How can two walk together unless they be agreed;" concealment is injurious to truth and dishonouring to Christ, and ought never to be practised. It has so much of hypocrisy mixed with it that we ought to avoid it as we do the viper in our path. It is usual for those who have prescription on their side, to regard themselves as the injured party when a division of sentiment takes place—but how people who were but yesterday of my opinion, can be outrageous with me to-day, because I think not as they think, is, to say the least of it, a little surprising. When we turn around, let the reason for our turning appear to us as justifiable as it may, we ought to be neither surprised nor offended if the world turn not with us. Let it not, however, be for a moment supposed, that I feel inclined to rebel against the authority of our church, or complain of those who have the direction of her course; for I hope, nay, I am sure, that they feel as little disposed to lord it over the conscience, as I do to submit to it.

Without admitting or controverting the sinfulness of slavery, it may not be amiss to submit a few plain propositions, which, if maturely considered, will lead men to think more logically on the subject. *By what power or authority has the black man been consigned to perpetual bondage?* By that of the commonwealth, unquestionably; individuals, as such, having no more to do with it than the inhabitants of another planet. Nine-tenths of our slaves descended to their present masters as a patrimonial inheritance. The law of the land and not an act of their own determined that they should be masters. Now as moral agents we are accountable only for actions in which we may exercise volition. Are individuals, as such, answerable for the unrighteous acts of the state? Without doubt they are not necessarily thus answerable. Do not the individuals who compose the commonwealth stand chargeable with the aggregate guilt resulting from its oppressive measures? Most certainly, but only such can be accounted guilty as sustain the ruling power of the state in its iniquitous course. Does not that master stand in the same position to a slave, who descended to him from his ancestors, as the kidnapper does to the man whom he feloniously steals from his country? This cannot be answered affirmatively, unless the master holds him *willingly*. From these plain positions, it would seem that a distinction ought to be made betwixt the master, who sustains the state in its iniquitous course, and he who stands in opposition to it.

These remarks have, perhaps, already exceeded the bounds that ought to have been assigned to them, but I feel as though I should treat Anti-Slavery with neglect, if I did not notice him. As you observe, he writes in a proper spirit, and says many good things. The great body of his argument, however, is not directed against any statement which I have expressed, or any position which I have attempted to maintain. I shall only notice one point, and that on account of its great practical importance.

He says, "It is just such characters as A. R. represents A. B. to be, that sustain slavery." Here I must surely have been misunderstood. If men would treat their slaves as A. B. is represented as treating his, they could not possibly be more useful to them, even in a pecuniary point of view, than indifferent hirelings, and the masters would have all the duties of guardians and protectors to perform, without remuneration. If such regulations could be enforced, it would prove the utter destruction of the system, and that, too, without delay. It is a fact, that few will deny who are acquainted with the south, that there are thousands of slave-holders who perform the duties of master, upon the very same principles, that their slaves perform their tasks—that of necessity. This is evident from the efforts which have been made, at various times, in different places, to free the slaves. To increase the number of this class, and to strengthen their hands, would seem to be a reasonable mode of abolishing the entire system, as it is generally acknowledged, that it is the slave-holders themselves that must do the work.

I think our author manifestly labours under confusion of thought. He speaks of freeing the slaves, at the same time deprecating the idea of leaving them subject to the action of law, in case of death.

or insolvency. He talks of their remaining in the employment of their former masters, while he intimates very plainly, that he regards slave-holders as no better than kidnappers. Whether he means legal or nominal freedom, he does not say; but it would seem from the general tenor of his suggestions, that one and the other mode was alternately prevailing in his imagination. The idea of a man freeing his slaves, and retaining them in his employ, can only be entertained by those who are satisfied with very loose thinking. How is it possible, for any one seriously to urge that masters may continue their slaves, after freeing them, in their employ, and yet shield them from their liabilities for the payment of debts, or descent to heirs, or even sale, as coloured persons running at large, without evidence of freedom, is more than I can conjecture. But Anti-Slavery thinks that bad as the people are in the south, these anticipated fearful consequences would not result to those who were freed, whether legally or otherwise, he has not informed us. Now it might be sufficient to reply, that he has much more confidence in the humanity and kindness of the southern people than I have, although I have never pronounced or thought them as bad as kidnappers. Among the Alpine hills, or Piedmont valleys of the south, where liberty is still fanned by freedom's breath, respect for the image of our Maker, as imprinted on the black man's face, may shield him from violence; but from the lessons of experience, which we have already had, we are warranted in saying, that in either the north or the south, the east or the west, it is, at best, only a cobweb security. Free them in the only way in which it can be done, and suffer them to remain where they are, and they must continue at the mercy of every vagabond who may choose to injure or insult them. I have already uttered such a sentiment as this, and it ought to be "iterated and reiterated," not only by the Monitor, but by every press throughout the land,—That, though substantial freedom be a precious boon, yet nominal freedom and substantial bondage is a curse rather than a blessing.

Our author, pressed on all hands, comes to the conclusion that if matters must come to extremities, let events take their course; it cannot possibly be worse than what we daily witness, as the legitimate fruit of the system of slavery itself. He thinks that such odious consequences might awaken inquiry, and be finally productive of benefit. Here he surely reasons in opposition to the plainest dictates of a sound understanding. If, through the prevalence of a monstrous vice, public sentiment becomes callous, is it likely to be awakened by the occasional perpetration of those very scenes which have blunted it? I, too, will inquire what might not be the influence of such examples? Assuredly, it would be any thing else than salutary. When worldly men, men who are every day virtually saying, "Who is the Lord that we should obey him?" see men who profess godliness, in effect visiting upon the heads of their defenceless dependents, the very worst evils attendant upon the foulest system of iniquity that ever disgraced the name of a community, that called itself Christian; will they not be hardened in sin, and blaspheme that worthy name whereby the Christian is called? Will such examples soften their hearts, and enlist their feelings in behalf of the pleading of such advocates? On the contrary, will

they not be more and more persuaded that whatever may be the pretensions of such to elevation of principle, and sanctity of life, they are nevertheless hateful deceivers, and selfish hypocrites?

We are here told that, "Reformation work is severe work, that it is like plucking out right eyes, and cutting off right hands, and that the innocent are often involved with the guilty." I feel the utmost respect for Anti-Slavery; I question not his piety, I question not the powers of his understanding, nor do I call in question the goodness of his heart; but is not this scripture wofully misapplied? If it were the cutting off of our own right hands, or the casting from us our own right eyes, I could let it pass most certainly without rebuke. But who here is the sufferer? Does he call upon the sinner to mortify his darling lusts,—to cease rolling sin as a sweet morsel under his tongue? No such thing. It is the suffering, unoffending African,—the frantic husband, the weeping wife, and the fatherless children whom he would dismember; while those whose darling lusts ought to be mortified remain unscathed? It may be said that masters in this case would be sufferers, but this I deny, as we are speaking with special reference to those who regard the freeing of their slaves as a privilege, and not as a sacrifice.

Many persons, foreseeing that to free slaves and suffer them to remain where they are, would only expose them to additional hardships, insist that it is the duty of their masters to transport them beyond the operation of those laws which oppress them. That such may be the requisitions of the law of love, under a supposed condition of things, may readily be admitted; but to assert it without any qualifying reservations, is saying more than can be successfully maintained. Man's circumstances change, but principles are immutable. If this doctrine had been preached at the promulgation of the gospel dispensation, who does not see that it would have involved consequences horrible to contemplate? The tenderest relations of life would not have been disrupted, but the Christian bondman must be transported to remote, and to him unknown regions, and cast among those of strange language, strange laws, barbarous in manners and customs, and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. Has any one who advocates this course ever realized it in his own bosom and conscience? It is known, that notwithstanding all the unfavourable influences which bear upon the interests and feelings of masters and slaves, there is nevertheless in many cases a strong family attachment, something like that engendered by kindred ties subsisting between them. Now for one not only to consent to, but to drive from his house a member of his family, who must abandon every earthly tie, and take up his abode in a distant strange land, is a task which a martyr would shudder to exchange for the stake. We think it cruel that free people of colour should be compelled, through force of circumstances, to give a reluctant consent to be transported to the land from whence their forefathers came; but this does not unavoidably involve the disruption of ties which the law of God says shall not be broken.

Admit that they ought to be thus transported, who ought to do it? We are told that this is a duty which masters owe their servants. This does not clearly appear. It has already been shown that it is the commonwealth, and not the master, who has made the

black man a slave, and, consequently, if the master withdraws his claim upon him, he stands precisely in the same relation to him as any other member of the community. If it be asserted that for former services rendered by the slave, the master is thus bound, I reply, that the slave may or he may not have rendered unrequited service. If he has, he ought to be compensated according to his equitable right; but this implies not the most remote obligation to place him in a foreign country. Besides, has this man, whom we now contemplate as free, no right of volition? If he chooses, like the servant of old, to say he loves his master, his wife and his children, may he not have his ear bored, and serve him for ever?

What would be a reasonable conclusion drawn from the positions here maintained? If I have been at all successful, is it not plain that if the slave-holder treats his slaves according to the directions of the divine law, in reference to servants, and manifests a willingness to surrender them into the hands of the church, to be disposed of in such manner as it may deem best calculated to promote their spiritual and temporal interests, they ought not to be regarded as worthy of censure?

A. R.

ART. IV.—*Occasional Hearing*.—No. III.

BY A RULING ELDER.

HAVING proved the first two things proposed, I shall proceed to the third and last, which was—That ministers of *all* other denominations, stand on the same ground in relation to us, as our own do while under suspension. And if this proposition can be clearly established, I apprehend that the doctrine, that occasional hearing is sinful, will be fairly and fully proved.

But, before advancing the arguments to establish the point in question, it will be necessary to make some remarks respecting suspension, and those who may be its objects. Suspension is an act of discipline of divine appointment, and is expressed in scripture, by such terms, as, “withdrawing from,” not “having fellowship with,” &c.; and is the church’s declaring that the person or persons suspended, have been guilty of sin, either in principle or practice, which they have not yet forsaken, or, for which the church is not yet fully satisfied of their penitence; and that she cannot hold fellowship and communion with them, while they continue in their present condition. And the more common way by which this is effected, is, by church judicatories, excluding individuals from the privileges of the church. But it sometimes happens that the majority of the church are the offenders, and the minority cannot obtain a vote to exclude the guilty from ordinances: In such a case, however, they can do the same thing, by withdrawing from the majority, stating their reasons for so doing; which is virtually as much suspending of the others according to the scriptural meaning of the term, as though they had done it by direct vote. And, what is bound on earth, is only bound in heaven when it is in accordance with the requirements of the scriptures.

With regard to those who may be the objects of suspension, I would observe, it is only such as have made a profession of the Christian religion—those who have come within the pale of the visible church; for, saith the apostle, “What have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within?” Now all, or nearly all denominations of Christians acknowledge professors of other denominations to be members of the visible church, by receiving into their communion those who have been baptized in other denominations, without rebaptizing; and by receiving ministers and elders, who have been ordained in other denominations, without reordination. Having made these remarks, I proceed to prove the point in question, namely, that ministers of all other denominations stand on the same ground in relation to us, as our own do while under suspension.

When the Associate Church published to the world their Act and Testimony, they thereby publicly declared on what principle they would hold communion with professing Christians. All who accede to these principles, and have a walk and conversation becoming the gospel, we take into our communion; while we reject all who hold any principle opposed to the truths therein witnessed for; believing that on scriptural grounds, such persons could neither be received, nor continued in our communion. And by this, we virtually say, such persons, if professors, are suspended from the communion of the Associate Church; for observe, they do *not* say that they are not members of the visible church; neither do they say, that they will *never* hold communion with them. But they do say that they consider them members of the visible church; which is evident from the fact, that we receive without rebaptizing and reordaining those who leave the communion of other churches, and join ours. And they farther say, that they will hold communion with them, as soon as they accede to our principles; which is placing them on the same ground with those of our own ministers, whom we may suspend for error.

Again, if our Act and Testimony be a judicial act, declaring ourselves in communion with all churches who hold the truths therein witnessed for, the reverse will necessarily follow, that it is a judicial act, excluding from our communion, for the time being, all those who reject any of those truths, which is suspension, according to the definition given of the term.

But to illustrate this point still farther, let us suppose that a minister of the Associate Church falls into the errors of some of the surrounding denominations, say the Arminian errors, he would be suspended from the communion of the church; but farther, suppose that a minister from some denominations holding the Arminian errors, should make application to be received into the communion of the Associate Church, reserving the privilege to hold and teach his Arminian principles, he would be rejected. Now as both these individuals have been rejected from the communion of the church for the same sin, they must surely stand on the same ground. But all other denominations have been rejected from the communion of the Associate Church, whether they desire admission or not, on account of their errors, which are declared in our Act and Testimo-

ny to be sinful. Therefore, they also stand in the same relation to us as this suspended minister—the thing to be proved.

But again, let us suppose farther, that the individual in the first supposed case, should join after he was suspended the denomination whose principles he had embraced, this step would be a total rejection of the authority of the court who had suspended him, and would be but augmenting his sin. Now it has been proved that it would be sinful to hear such a minister preach, before he had taken this last step, and as this would be only increasing his sin, it cannot be right now. For it is presumed, none will plead that to reject the authority of a court disannuls its just decisions. Therefore, as it is still sinful to hear this individual preach, if ministers of other denominations stand in a different relation to us, than our own do while under suspension, then it follows that there are in other denominations, some ministers holding the same principles, and of equal standing among themselves, some of whom it would be sinful to hear, while others it would not, which is absurd, and would, if true, lead to inextricable difficulty and confusion.

But perhaps it may be objected that there must be some difference in the relation between us and our own ministers, while under suspension, and the relation in which we stand to ministers of other denominations, as, in case the former should return to our communion, they would be rebuked for their errors, while the latter would be received without any censure.* To this it may be replied, that this by no means proves that in the last case, they are not as really suspended as in the other, any more than in the case where two individuals are suspended for intemperance: in the event of their restoration, the greater offender is rebuked, while the other is only admonished,—if even that would prove that they both had not been suspended.

It is presumed that the above remarks conclusively show, that ministers of other denominations stand on the same ground, in relation to us, as our own do while under suspension, and all professors with whom we will not commune, are held in the same condition; and, therefore, the doctrine is established, that occasional hearing is sinful.

* It is the universal practice of courts in the Associate Church, as far as the writer is informed, to receive into our communion professors of other denominations, on their acceding to our principles, without requiring them to acknowledge their sin for their past errors, and without censuring them for this sin. But this, no doubt, is a dereliction of duty; and one, for which churches are frequently severely chastised. Now, if such persons made application who were guilty of some scandal, a different course would be pursued. For they who sin before all, must be rebuked before all. But how has it come to pass that this scripture rule is only applied to some kinds of sins? But farther, were applicants for admission, from other denominations, required to acknowledge their sins for their past errors, and to submit to censure for them, we would not have so many examples of individuals who had become offended, not at their principles, but at their ministers, session, or some members of the congregation, acceding to our principles in full, and then, in a short time, because some of these principles were preached, which in heart they never believed, take offence and return to their former profession, if not to one still more unsound.†

† An acknowledgment of sin for "past errors," is implied in the application for admission to our communion, whether the applicants come from the world or ano-

ART. V.—*Extracts from a Clergyman's Diary.*

A MERCY TO BE IGNORANT OF THE FUTURE.

It would be both sinful and foolish, to wish to know how long we shall live, and where, and how, we shall die. It is sinful thus to attempt to penetrate into what God has not revealed; to attempt to lift the veil which covers the counsels of Jehovah; to break through the clouds which surround the throne of Him who holds in his hand the keys of life and of death.

And it would be *foolish* to wish to know the moment when our numbered days will be closed in death. If the veil which covers our future prospects were instantly withdrawn, and all that would come upon us thrown open to our view, we would see reason to adore the wisdom and mercy of God in hiding the future from us under a dark and mysterious veil. If blessings were in store for us, we would be so eager to grasp them, as to forget present duty, and present mercies. If the sinner saw before him a long and prosperous career; that the sword might pass through a land, but should not kill him; that the pestilence might hurry thousands around him to their graves, but should not touch him; such an individual, with such knowledge, would be a curse to society. No crime that he would not commit, who thus knew, that for these crimes, death could not overtake him. He would trample on every law human and divine. He would brave the vengeance of God and man. He would neglect his duty, and destroy his soul. Again, if the believer saw before him days and nights of bitterness and sorrow; if he beheld overwhelming trials rushing upon him, and death following after, to close in a month, or year, the painful scene; fear and anguish would fill his soul; the dismal prospect would plant his pillow with thorns, and lead him sinfully to wish for death before his Father's work was ended.

AFFLICTIONS.

Afflictions, what are they but love tokens from my Lord, marks of his favour which he has put upon me; ornaments more precious

than our profession, differing from ours. They are not censured for past errors, because our ecclesiastical jurisdiction does not extend beyond our own communion. We do not read that the apostles inflicted censure for past errors upon any class of applicants. They required *confession*, evidence of repentance, and a *profession* to avoid their past errors in future. Applicants from other denominations lying under charges of scandal, should be remitted to the body in which the offence was committed, to give the requisite satisfaction to the party more immediately offended. If, however, this be altogether impracticable, it is supposed our courts may proceed to require satisfaction according to the established laws of discipline, either of the body from which they came, or of our own body, or of both; should there be any difference between the laws of the respective bodies, not unscriptural.

Persons making application from unworthy motives, the case supposed by our correspondent, at the close of his note, if these motives can be discovered by sufficient evidence, (and a rigid examination of principles will generally develop their motives,) are to be promptly rejected, regardless of the source from which they may come, till they give sufficient evidence of repentance and reformation. The direction of the apostle to Simon Magus, is suitable to such persons.—EDW. R. L. Mox.

than pearls, and gold; badges of sonship for which I bless him. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

DEATH ENDS ALL THE HOPES OF THE WICKED.

The wicked man in this world may be wealthy, and honourable. With the rich man in the parable, he may be clothed in purple, and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day. He may be able to say, exulting in hope of future pleasure, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years. He may have no pangs of conscience. It may be seared. As he has by his worldly life made it his interest that there should be no Judge, no hereafter, so he may try to believe, that the judgment is a jest, eternity a dream, and death an eternal sleep. As he has lived like a brute, only for this world, so like the brutes he hopes to die. Every day that rolls over him may find him revelling in wealth, and rioting in sinful pleasure. Every day may add to his gains till he can scarcely count his money, or compute the value and extent of his possessions. He may be looking forward to years of prosperity, and ease; when, in a moment, God will cast the fury of his wrath upon him. The arrow of death will reach his heart. "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee. *This night*, devils commissioned as the executioners of divine justice shall demand thy soul, to be dragged away in its wickedness into the fire of hell. "Then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" Your heir may be a wise man, or he may be a fool. He may curse and not bless your memory for what you have hoarded up. But whether improved, or misimproved, these riches are gone from the dying man. For them he has offended his God. For them he has wasted his day of mercy. For them he has sold his soul. And now, when his eyes are closing in death, his body racked with pain, and his soul convulsed with agony while hovering on the brink of an unknown eternity; his splendid mansion, his full tables, his boundless wealth cannot stay the hand of the avenger. Die he must. Even now the hand of death is on him. His last pulse is beating, the shadow of death is over him, his last breath is dying away, the film of death has covered his eyes, the clammy dampness of death is felt on the lifeless clay, and he has sunk down with a fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation to consume and overwhelm his soul. Before the corpse is wrapped in its winding sheet, before the friends have had time to tell his acquaintance the time of his funeral, before the body is laid in the coffin, and carried out to the grave, the soul is sentenced, and in the deep ocean of the wrath of God buried for ever. While the prophesier of smooth things is pouring forth perhaps false, and unwarranted, and delusive praise over his corpse; the soul has heard the voice of the God of the Bible, the Lord of judgment, "Depart, ye cursed," and is sinking in the abyss of wo. While the careless and worldly attendants on the funeral, full of their dangerous and unscriptural charity, are talking about the certainty of his salvation, or saying, "if he is not safe, alas, for thousands!" the soul has become the sport and prey of malignant fiends. A splendid shroud, a gorgeous coffin encloses, and a pompous funeral attends his lifeless clay; but

the flames of hell are the soul's winding-sheet, the prison of hell the soul's grave, in which it must lie and suffer for ever. The sword is drawn which will pursue it for ever. The flames are kindled which will burn over it for ever. How different from this the death of the Christian! He is not afraid to die. Believing in Jesus, relying on his infinite merits, washed in his atoning blood, covered with the spotless robe of his righteousness; the Christian regards death as one of his treasures; the valley of the shadow of death as the way to that blessed world, "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. True it is, that God sometimes, to teach us his sovereignty in the bestowal of his grace, to show us that we are to judge of the state of the departed more from the holy principles, and devoted life, than from a death-bed, permits those who are dear to him to die under a cloud, to go down to the grave filled with fear, till the very moment that the glories of heaven burst upon the disembodied soul. Still, in whatever way the believer dies, his soul is safe. The hand of death, a messenger of mercy to him, has gently cut the thread of life, the spirit is free, the veil is drawn, eternity stands disclosed, the gates of heaven are open, and the heir of glory enters in. Well may he call the veil of death, what Jacob called the place where the angels met him, *Mahanaim*: for there the hosts of God, the glorious angels, will meet the child of God, encamp around him to defend him on his death-bed from the bands of fallen spirits, and bear in triumph the freed and ransomed soul to the throne of their Father, and our Father, of their God, and our God.

MANTON.

ART. VI.—*Letter to the Editor*

FROM REV. A. WHITE.

York Dist., S. C., Nov. 23, 1839.

MY DEAR SIR:—The Religious Monitor, for November, has just been received. Permit me, sir, to call your attention to the extraordinary communication, "respecting a supposed error in the minutes of synod." I cannot suppose you gave that communication, so much at variance with facts and the spirit of the gospel, your wonted attention; for its admission into the pages of the Monitor is contrary to the profession you have uniformly made. The admission of such an insidious attack upon the character of members of synod, in as good standing certainly, as your correspondent, appears to me most extraordinary. Has it come to this, that we are "suspended brethren," and receive the first intimation of it through the pages of a periodical? If the synod, as your correspondent insinuates, has really suspended us, why have we not received intimation of the fact, long ago, by order of synod, and through some respectable channel, instead of hearing it for the first time through the press, and resting upon the authority of, (to us at least,) an irresponsible letter-writer? I must think it was an oversight, on the part of the editor, in giving publicity to such a paper, and confidently trust, that, in the succeeding number, the proper corrective will appear.

With your correspondent I can have nothing to do. From the spirit he has manifested, I have no hopes of redress, through him. I do not wish to know more of him than appears in his letter; at the same time I do not know but one source, from which it could spring. Who, or what is he, to denounce judgment upon brethren in the ministry, as though he were invested with papal powers? Who is he, that pretends to the gift of prescience,—that usurps the prerogative of Jehovah, and declares with so much assurance, the course which will be pursued by the “southern brethren.” The “southern brethren” are prepared to act, when the period for action arrives; and if they could for a moment suppose, that your correspondent utters the language, and breathes the spirit of a synod of Christian ministers, they would not hesitate long as to their course; for with such spirits they have no sympathy, and will have no fellowship. Yours, truly,

ARCHIBALD WHYTE.

P. S. I think justice demands the publication of this brief notice, but if you deny me this poor privilege I have no redress. I hope however it will meet your approbation, and that you will give it a place in your next.

Remarks.—On this letter we have a few brief comments to offer:

1. It is admitted because it contains the *sign manual* of the writer, a circumstance, which, in our estimation, renders him only responsible. Had it been presented in the shape of an ordinary communication, its admission would, indeed, be “contrary to the profession we have uniformly made.”

2. A southern climate and familiarity with scenes of oppression, we fear, have exerted a deleterious influence on the amiable qualities, and suavity of manners, which formerly characterized our brother Whyte; and our prayer to God is, that he may not in the end, suffer loss through the pressure of these extraneous influences. This is to be feared; for nothing is more certain, than that the spirit of slavery first *blinds*, and then *inflames* the soul. It has produced this effect upon thousands, and the language of our brother’s letter gives us a sufficient warrant to say to him, “Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed, lest he fall.” “When Ephraim spake trembling, he exalted himself in Israel,” &c. Hos. xii. 1—3.

3. This letter contains an *implied* admission that the writer is involved in the sin of slavery; an admission which *we* certainly had not anticipated. This admission is implied in the sentence,—“If the synod, as your correspondent insinuates,” &c. Our correspondent *insinuated* nothing. He stated a fact, that “all slave-holders are suspended from the privilege of the church.” How brother Whyte could regard himself as suspended, without considering himself a slave-holder, is more than we can fathom.

4. The remark of our correspondent respecting the apprehended course of our southern brethren, was not in strict conformity with

that charity, which "thinketh no evil," and "hopeth all things," unless he had evidence, not in our possession: that he possessed such evidence, appears highly probable, nay, almost certain, both from his own, and Mr. Whyte's letter.

5. With Mr. Whyte's grievance at an act of synod, at a want of intimation of that act, through some *respectable* source, the nature of that redress, of which he speaks, his style of remark, &c., are things with which we have no particular concern, the discussion of which would be in some measure contrary to the course we have marked out for conducting the Religious Monitor, and the final issue of which belongs to Mr. W. and the synod, the only parties with whom it should be left.

Finally, it is not anticipated that our correspondent will see cause to offer any reply. Our pages should be filled with more useful topics.

ART. VII.—*Distinctive Names in Ecclesiastical Bodies.*

THE name by which a religious body is designated, is a matter of minor importance; it is, nevertheless, necessary as a mark of distinction, as names among men. Sectaries, of the most erroneous character, attach great importance to a name; and, of course, assume very plausible and imposing names. The infamous Joanna Southcott, who gave out that she was the destined mother of the Saviour, had inscribed upon her church the designation—House of God; a more appropriate designation, certainly, would have been—The Synagogue of Satan. The same may be said of modern Arians, who designate themselves the Christians, as if that designation were to them exclusive property. It is certainly very inappropriate to them, since they deny in Christ supreme divinity, the only consideration that can entitle him to our esteem and worship. The same may be said, also, of the great Antichrist, which assumes the undeserved designation of Holy Catholic Church; while, at the same time, she is the most unholy sectary that ever disgraced the Christian name; and is, accordingly, designated by inspiration—"The whore of Babylon, and mother of harlots." As, in judging of a book, we are to look farther than its title; so, in judging of a religious denomination, we must look farther than to their ecclesiastical name. You justly observe, Mr. Editor, in your November No., p. 291, that names come to lose their original meaning by division and subdivision, by relinquishing original principles, and assuming others of an opposite character. In this way, a party comes to have nothing original but the name. Having changed their principles, they have no more right to the original designation, than the wife who has left her husband, and associated with another man, has to be called by his name. Such persons considerably resemble the seven women, Isa. iv., who are said to take hold of one man, saying, "We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach." In times of the Reformation in England, considerable legacies were left to the Presbyterian Church.

The Arians, to have a pretext for claiming these legacies, assumed the Presbyterian name. So, of late, the New England Congregationalists, though Hopkinsian, have assumed the name Presbyterian, that they might seem akin to the Presbyterian Church, with which they have been most improperly incorporated.

When a party in a church change their principles, and yet retain the original name, they must thereby mean to impose deception upon their hearers, pretending to be still the same, that they may be induced to follow them in their receding courses. Were they to assume a new name, or connect themselves with another religious denomination, however congenial to their own views, it would forcibly suggest the idea that there was a change of principle, which might induce them to demur, if not entirely abandon them. When a change is designed, integrity requires an open avowal; then people could not be imposed upon: being warned, they can think and judge for themselves. The conduct of Paul, in this respect, was most exemplary and worthy of imitation: said he—"I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say." He wished the truth to be known, and he made known nothing but what he believed to be the truth. You justly observe that they (the seceding party) rob the Mother Church of the cognomen, which they inherited from their fathers, and justly merited by holding fast their very principles. Those holding the original principles, are certainly the exclusive proprietors of the name, originally assumed when the church was first organized. This will hold good, though the seceding brethren were not apostatizing, but even advancing in religion. This was well illustrated by the fathers of the Secession Church, who, upon abandoning connexion with the community established by law, on account of errors in doctrine, and other corruptions, took the appropriate designation of Seceders, or Secession Church; for this was precisely what they were; and this designation can with propriety belong to none but those holding the original principles of that church.

Some years ago, a division took place in the Reformed Dutch Church. The minority, holding the original principles of that church, took the prefix *True*, as an appropriate distinctive appellation: a designation which their erroneous brethren, though the majority, could not claim. These observations are occasioned, Mr. Editor, by your remarks on the two bodies claiming the designation Reformed Presbyterian. You justly observe, that a new appellative is necessary to distinguish the two bodies. I know of no distinctive appellation more appropriate than those of *Old and New Light*. These designations are not entirely novel. They were used in Scotland long since on a similar occasion, when a division took place in the Burgher Church. A New Light minister, in conversation with one of his elders on the subject of party differences, said, "It is dark times." "O no," said the elder, "there is much Old Light, and a good deal of New Light getting up!" Certainly when an individual or a party view things in a different light from what they formerly did, they must have got *new* light on those subjects. Since, then, the seceding brethren wish still to retain the original name, which they have legally forfeited, they cannot consider themselves as nick-named, in having the designation New Light prefixed. They ought thus to designate themselves, both in speaking and

writing. Though, unless holding fast what they have already attained, or going on to perfection, this New Light, as a Scotch author has called it, can be nothing but "*old darkness*." Any that would wish to have a view of the change of their principles, can have their wish fully gratified by reading the Newburg edition of Wylie's *Sons of Oil*. The contrast between that work and his Pastoral Letter is given in the appendix. The difference there brought to view, and other of their modern publications, compared with their former, fully entitle them to the designation of New Light. Then Old Light must belong, as a matter of course, to those holding their original principles.

Thus, Mr. Editor, I think I have furnished your *desideratum* of a cognomen, by which the two synods, without circumlocution, may be clearly distinguished.

Yours, &c.,

OLD LIGHT.

ART. VIII.—*How shall they preach, except they be sent?* Rom. x. 15.

MR. EDITOR—Unbelief, pride, and licentiousness, are the men of renown, the giants of our days; no precedent, or principle, or established order in church or state, is able to stand before them. Were it not that the Lord Christ, who is more of might by far, reigns, and hath an interest to support upon earth, we might well believe that the destruction of society was at hand. Christ puts forth his power for the protection of his interest, by his word and providence. The question at the top is a word from him—commanding many prominent agents to stop proceedings, and the people to cease from following them. How far a discussion of it may have this effect, remains with him to determine. We have, indeed, just reason to fear that his Holy Spirit hath ceased to strive with large numbers, in all the churches of the reformation. But, so long as the way is open, it is our duty to speak to men on this all-important subject. While I shall endeavour my best to answer the question, I ask the patient and serious attention of the reader.

The question implies its own answer in the negative. It is like other questions in the apostle's writings; for example—"How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" plainly we cannot. And his meaning is as plain, that they *cannot* preach who are not sent. If a man choose a text of scripture, and profess to discuss it, it includes all that many understand by *preaching the gospel*. Although he maintain the necessity of works as a ground of justification, or affirm a universal atonement, or deny the divinity of our Saviour, still it goes by the name of *preaching the gospel*. The ravings of fanaticism, and the dry morality of a heathen, claim this appellation equally with God's ordinance. But I need not spend time to prove that the claim of none of these will be allowed. To teach divine truth as a science, is not to preach the gospel. This, indeed, cannot be done in the church without being *sent*, still there is something more belongs to the preaching of the gospel that does not strictly belong to this. And it is this; namely, *authoritatively* to declare the truth, as a message from God to sinners, and to make an

offer of salvation to them in *Christ's name*. Luke xxiv. 47: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be *preached in his name* among all nations," &c. It is manifest that none can do this in sincerity and truth but those whom Christ has *sent* to do it. If any man would take on him to declare authoritatively the way of salvation, and make an offer of it to sinners, as God's offer to them, whom Christ had not commissioned to do so, would he not be an impostor? Suppose a rebellion had broken out in some part of the states, and the government had it in contemplation to offer them terms of peace, and some man, who happened to hear of them, takes it upon him, without the consent or appointment of the government, to go and offer these terms to the rebels; every man of common discernment can answer how *he* is to be regarded, and whether the government is in any measure bound to stand by his offer. So it is in this case.

The notion under which the gospel ought to be received necessarily implies, that he who preaches it ought to have a mission from *Him* whose gospel it is. It is this: "Because, when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth *the word of God*, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." 1 Thes. ii. 13. If it cannot be duly received, unless it be received *as the word of God*, it ought to be delivered as his word, or as a *word from him*. But none can bear a word from him unless *he send* them with it. The character every where given to the gospel implies that the preacher is one *sent* by the author of it. *First*, it is called a *word sent*. Acts xiii. 26: "To you is the word of this salvation *sent*." To the same purpose it is called *tidings*, ver. 32: "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made to the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same to us their children." Rom. x. 16. It is called "glad tidings of good things." The bearer of tidings was a messenger appointed for the purpose. *Second*. It is called *the word of Christ*. "If ye abide in me and *my words* abide in you," &c. John xv. 7. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly," &c., Col. iii. 16. In Thess. ii. 13, and many other places, it is called "the word of God." If it is the word of God, then he that delivers it must first *receive* it from God, for this purpose. Gal. i. 11, 12. "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." The terms of office which belong to those who preach, necessarily imply that they must act under a commission from the Head of the church. Paul styles himself "a servant of Jesus Christ." Rom. i. 1. James says he is "a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ." Ch. i. 1. And Peter, "a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. i. 1. "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." ver. 1. "And he sent and signified by his angel to his servant John." Rev. i. 2. This name belongs to all who preach the gospel, and Christ is their Master, and consequently they are employed and sent by him. The term minister is of similar import. It is one who serves or administers to the church's necessities, whether in temporals or spirituals, according to an *appointment*, according to the following texts: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but *ministers* by whom ye believed, *even as the*

Lord gave to every man?" 1 Cor. iii. 5 "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ," ch. iv. 1.

In the same place they are called "Stewards of the mysteries of God." If stewards, they must be first put into the stewardship (which is the same thing as commissioning them to preach;) and he who puts them into it "requires that they be found faithful."

Again, they are called ambassadors; that is, one who negotiates at a foreign court in the name of his prince. But, before one can be an ambassador, he must receive from his prince both *credentials* and *instructions*. So it is precisely in this case.

Let us hear the infallible authority—"And hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed to us the word of reconciliation. Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us. We pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. Perhaps there is no text exhibits more fully and expressly the truth which I am endeavouring to illustrate than this. In perfect agreement with this, Christ says, Mat. x. 40, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me;" because he had said before, ver. 16, "Behold I send you forth." The importance and necessity of a divine appointment to preach the gospel will be seen in the most clear and forcible light in what the Scriptures declare respecting Christ's own appointment: for he was himself *sent*. He received his appointment immediately from the Father, and he was emphatically the minister of the gospel as none ever was. It is remarkable, too, that the Spirit of God has declared at the same place where Christ's call to office is proved, that no man can have the honour of office by taking it at his own hand. Heb. v. 4: "And no man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Not that no man has attempted to take it, for many have, both under the old and new dispensations; but they cannot in this way ever possess it. "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee." "As he saith also in another place, Thou art a Priest for ever," &c. Never was any mission so fully attested to the church as his was. Many of his *names* are taken from it, such as Shiloh, Messiah, Angel, Messenger of the covenant, and Christ. His conception in the womb and his birth were announced to the church by an angel from heaven, as one whom the Father had chosen and *sent*. When he was presented to the Lord in the temple, according to the law, the Holy Ghost pointed him out under this character to Simeon and Anna. At his baptism a public attestation was given to him, when the heavens opened, by the Father and the Holy Spirit. And he himself lays the greatest stress upon it. He urges his being anointed and sent of the Father, as the great reason why he ought to be received, and obeyed. He makes mention of it with a frequency that is truly remarkable. Take the following instance, John iv. 34: "My meat is to do the will of him that *sent* me, and to finish his work." Ch. v. 23, "He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that *sent* him." Ver. 24, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that *sent* me, hath everlasting life." Ver. 30, "Because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father

which hath *sent* me." Ver. 36, "The works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath *sent* me, and the Father himself which hath *sent* me, hath borne witness of me." Ch. vi. 38, 39, "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that *sent* me. And this is the Father's will which hath *sent* me," &c. Ver. 40, "And this is the will of him that *sent* me, That every one which seeth the Son," &c. Ver. 44, "No man can come to me, except the Father, which *sent* me, draw him." Ver. 57, "As the living Father hath *sent* me, and I live by the Father," &c. Ch. vii. 16, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that *sent* me." Ch. viii. 16, 18, "For I am not alone, but I and the Father that *sent* me, and the Father that *sent* me beareth witness of me." Ch. xi. 4, "I must work the works of him that *sent* me while it is day." Ch. x. 36, "Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and *sent* into the world, Thou blasphemest." Ch. xi. 42, "But because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast *sent* me." Ch. xii. 24, "Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that *sent* me." I forbear to quote a great many more texts in which the same thing is asserted. Is it then to be supposed for a moment, while a mission from the Father is so indispensable and important to *him*, who is Wisdom and Truth itself, who is holy, harmless and without guile, that fallen and apostate man may enter on the *same work without one*? Is man more capable and trustworthy than God? Christ himself has given us to understand, very plainly, that a divine mission from Him is as indispensable to us, as was a mission from the Father to him, or rather, that we must receive of the very same authority at his hand, and every one severally as he willeth. John xvii. he says, in his intercessory prayer, "As thou hast *sent* me into the world, even so have I also *sent* them into the world," ver. 18. And after his resurrection, ch. xx. 21, he addressed the same words to the disciples. "As *my* Father hath *sent* me, even so *send* I you." And when, in connexion with this, we consider that a short time after this, and before he ascended, he gave in form what was to be the terms of the commission, to preach his gospel to the end of the world, as follows: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. And as this was among the last things, or the very last which he did, we may warrantably conclude that the question is answered, that none can "preach, except they be *sent*." This was not, as any may see, meant exclusively for the Apostles; they were not to live to the end of the world, but this gospel was to be preached to the end of it, and here is the authority which Christ meant to be given and received to preach it till that time. That the church did act agreeably to this, till she began to "Leave her first love," and grow corrupt, is not to be doubted. What Paul says to Timothy, may be considered as representing her uniform practice for a long time. "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Tim. ii. 2. Long after this time we find the church of Ephesus commended by the Lord Christ for

calling pretenders to an account, and inflicting upon them merited censure. "And thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars," Rev. ii. 2.

In conclusion, on this question, it may not be improper to notice, that a Divine commission to teach or preach in the church was deemed as highly important under the law as it is under the gospel. Witness, for example, how particularly the commission of Moses is set down, Exod. chapter iii.—iv. And as an attestation of it to the people, and to Pharaoh, he was empowered to work two miracles. No less striking were the proofs of Aaron's call to the priesthood. Besides God's express intimation of his election to that office, he must be publicly and solemnly invested with it, before all the people. The space of time which was occupied with this was no less than eight days, and the account of it takes up wholly the eighth and ninth chapters of Leviticus. And when all this did not yet satisfy a number of them, the Lord farther attested his appointment in the most awful and incontestable manner—first by the destruction of Korah and his company, and Dathan and Abiram; second, by causing Aaron's rod to bud; and by causing the brassen censers used by Korah, to be made into a covering to the altar, that as long as the children of Israel should see them there, they might remember that it was a perilous undertaking, indeed, to approach God's altar, *without being sent*. The account of this also fills two chapters, the sixteenth and seventeenth of Numbers.

In a most solemn, and impressive manner, were the Levites also invested with their office. First, they were to be cleansed, then offerings were to be offered for them—farther the whole assembly was to be gathered, and they were to put their hands on the Levites, then Aaron was to offer them before the Lord, for an offering of the children of Israel, "That they may execute the service of the Lord," Num. chapter viii. When Joshua was to succeed Moses, he also must be called, and receive a charge. "And Moses and Joshua went and presented themselves in the tabernacle of the congregation."—"And he (the Lord) gave Joshua the son of Nun a charge, and said, Be strong, and of good courage, for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I swear unto them: and I will be with thee," Deut. xxxi. 15, 23.

As to the prophets, there was this rule to be observed. Any one claiming to have an immediate mission from God as a prophet, must both preach sound doctrine and work a miracle. If he did not speak according to the law, or if he enticed the people to idolatry, though he did *seem* to work a miracle, yet was he not to be believed, but to be laid hold of, as an impostor, and put to death. "If there arise among you a prophet—or dreamer of dreams, and give thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them, thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet—and that prophet or dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death," Deut. xiii. 1, 2, 3, 5. "But the prophet that shall *presume* to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not

spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously," chapter xviii. 20.

If this question, and its answer, shall be deemed worthy of a place in your pages, I propose as soon as I can to send the following questions and their answers. How are men sent to preach? How may the people *know* when they are sent, and when not? In what light is the preaching of unsent men, to be viewed? Have we any warrant to expect a blessing upon such preaching? What is likely to be the effect of it? What is the spirit of the times? What is our duty?

ΔΙΑΚΟΝΟΣ.

ART. IX.—*Efforts of Calvin and Farel for the Maintenance of Discipline.*

BERTELIER, one of the factious, a man of the most abandoned impudence, who had been forbidden the Lord's table by the presbytery on account of his many crimes, entered the senate, and petitioned them to authorize the abrogation of his sentence. Had this request been granted, all the bonds of church discipline would undoubtedly have been broken, and all church order immediately dissolved. Calvin, therefore, with great earnestness and boldness, in the name of the presbytery, opposed it, and proved that the magistrate ought to be the avenger, not destroyer of the sacred laws, and he neglected nothing which so momentous a dispute required. The false clamours of those, who asserted that the presbytery, in some cases, usurped the power of the magistrates, triumphed; and a resolution was passed, on the question being brought before the grand council of two hundred, that the final decision, on all cases of excommunication, should be vested in the senate, with a power to absolve such as they thought fit. Agreeably to this decision, Bertelier secretly obtained letters abrogating his sentence, and confirmed by the seal of the state, from the senate, which did not at that time direct its attention to the careful investigation of this subject. Perrin, and his faction, expected that Calvin would either disobey the orders of the senate, and thus sink under popular tumult, or if he obeyed them, all the authority of the presbytery, and with it all the powerful restraints upon the wicked would, without difficulty, be afterwards broken for ever. But Calvin, having received notice of this resolution only two days before the administration of the supper, as usual, in September, uttered, during the sermon with uplifted hands, and in a solemn tone, many severe denunciations against the profaners of mysteries whose sacred character he described; and "for my own part," said he, (after the example of Chrysostom,) "I will rather suffer myself to be slain, than allow this hand to stretch forth the sacred things of the Lord to those who are lawfully condemned as despisers of God." This voice, wonderful to state, produced such an effect, even upon his unbridled enemies, that Perrin immediately gave secret orders to Bertelier, not to present himself at the table, and the sacred mysteries were cele-

brated with a surprisingly profound silence, and under a solemn awe, as if the Deity himself had been visible among them. But, after dinner, in the course of his explaining that remarkable passage in the Acts of the Apostles, where Paul bids farewell to the church of Ephesus, Calvin protested that he was not the man who either himself knew any thing about resisting magistrates, or taught others to do so, and exhorted, at considerable length, the people to persevere in the doctrine which they had heard. And in conclusion, as if it was the last sermon he would preach at Geneva, he said, "Since affairs are in such a state, permit me also, brethren, to apply to you the language of the apostle, 'I commend you to God and to the word of his grace.'" These words struck his abandoned enemies dumb, in a surprising manner, and the good were more seriously confirmed and admonished of their duty. Calvin, the next day, accompanied by his colleagues and the presbytery, deliberately demanded of the senate, and the council of two hundred, that their case should be determined by the people themselves, since the law, whose abrogation was then under consideration, had been made by the people.

The opinions of these two ruling bodies were changed after such observations, and it was resolved that the decree of two hundred should be suspended, the four reformed states of Switzerland consulted, and no alteration in the mean time should take place in the existing laws. Thus the storm being broken rather than quelled, the leaders of the faction endeavoured, from the concurrence of particular circumstances, to make it fall upon the head of Farel, which, contrary to all expectation, had been averted from that of Calvin. For Farel, who had suffered so severely from a violent disease in the month of March, visited Geneva as soon as the restoration of his health allowed. In his sermon, relying on the justice of the cause, on his age, and former influence, he reproved with great keenness the supporters of faction. They complained loudly that Farel had done them a serious injury, and on his return to Neufchâtel they procured letters from the senate to the government of that state, for the purpose of allowing Farel to be summoned to Geneva, and to answer for himself on the day appointed. Farel came, and was exposed to considerable danger from the factious, who cried out, that he ought to be thrown into the Rhone for his conduct. A prudent, discreet, courageous young man, in the first place, frequently warned Perrin to use every exertion that the common father, as it were, of the city, might not suffer any injury. He was afterwards joined by one of his companions, another young man of integrity, who advised such as were friends of good order what measures they ought to adopt. The concourse of a great part of the city took place when Farel seated himself in the court. His accusers, astonished at this circumstance, and being now anxious for their own personal safety, earnestly entreated for the acquittal of Farel, after an audience had been given him. Thus nearly the whole of the year was spent against the wicked, in contending either for good doctrine, or wholesome discipline.—*Beza's Life of Calvin.*

ART. X.—*An Incidental Argument against Immersion.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTOR.

SIR,—In reading the 47th verse of the 10th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, the other night, I was particularly struck with the expression, "*Can any man forbid water*, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" To my mind it conveyed a powerful argument in favour of administering the ordinance of baptism by the application of water to the person, and not by putting the person into the water. The argument was all the more powerful that it was indirect, undesignedly introduced. The apostle does not seem in this passage, to have had any thought of a controversy about the mode of administering baptism: but satisfied that these Gentiles were partakers of the thing signified by baptism, he considers it unreasonable that they should be deprived of the sign, and asks, "*Can any man forbid water* that these should not be baptized?" Now I ask could such language have been used with any degree of propriety, upon the supposition that they were to go to the water and be dipped into it? Does not the expression plainly intimate that the water was to be brought to them, and to be applied to them? I do not adduce this as the strongest argument in favour of baptism by sprinkling, nor would I rest the decision of a controversy upon an incidental expression. Nevertheless, I think it ought not to be overlooked. I do not know whether the idea is new to me or not; nor, if not, where I got it; but it never struck me so forcibly at any former period.

If you think the above worthy of a place in your interesting miscellany, it is at your service, from a
 CONSTANT READER.

ART. XI.—*Essay on Family Worship.*

By the Rev. W. H. Burns, of Kilsyth.

PART I.—THE OBLIGATIONS TO FAMILY WORSHIP, DERIVED FROM REASON AND SCRIPTURE.

IN the devout observance of the LORD'S DAY, all ages and all ranks are directly and nearly concerned;—the child, the youth, the adult, the gray-haired, the leaner on the staff of age, and the dying, who would enter on the saint's everlasting rest. The subject of this essay is one more immediately, though not exclusively, addressed to the heads of families, whose appropriate duty it is to erect an altar for God's worship in their dwellings; to appoint the time suitable for convening their households for the offices of social worship, and to conduct the service, Abraham-like—acting as the Prophet, Priest, and King, "commanding their children and household to keep the way of the Lord." (Gen. xix. 18.)

As the *Sabbath* is *ancient*, co-eval with the creation,—so is family worship of great antiquity, co-eval with man's social and *domestic* relationship.

This is the first argument for family worship. God is not only the author of our being, and our happiness, as individuals; but of all our social and domestic relations and comforts. By him families are constituted; our times are in his hands; and he fixes the bounds of our habitations. He gives us houses to dwell in, he builds up families, and opens

up all the springs of domestic happiness. "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it;" and except the Lord keep the citadel of the family, watching will be vain; early rising and late taking rest will be unproductive of real benefit. (Ps. cxxvii.) What then can be more undeniably and plainly incumbent upon heads of families, than to offer up, in the name and behalf of all the members, devout acknowledgments of the goodness of their common Parent and Benefactor, and to ask of the Lord the blessing which they in common need, and without which they can have no real comfort?

In a well-regulated family, the several members attend not merely each to individual comfort. They do not *eat* each his morsel alone, but in company. Why then should they be separated from each other in *religious duties*? why should they not make *this* not merely an individual and personal, but also a joint and united concern, which is, of all others, the most interesting and important?

In common and ordinary cases, have families a *head* and a *government*; and only in the most important concerns, shall every one do what is right in his own eyes? Shall there be here no concert, no order, no union observed? Shall the members of a family hold a concert together in regard to their temporal concerns, and hold none about their spiritual interests? Shall they join in petitioning, or using means for gaining any advantage for the common good from fellow-creatures, and no joint efforts be made, and no joint petition be offered to God, to the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift, soliciting his favour, protection, and blessing? In religion alone shall the family interests be neglected, or left entirely to each member, to be sought or neglected? Within the precincts of a family, where there is no family worship—there may be—there frequently are, God's "hidden ones;" yea, there may be a *Joseph*, on whose account the Lord blesses and prospers the family, whose head is graceless and prayerless; but *as a family*, it is justly said of such, that it is *without God*—just as a *nation* which has no public recognition of God is an atheistical nation, whatever may be the character or the number of religious *individuals* in that nation.

The next argument I would bring forward, in urging upon *you* who are heads of families, the duty of family worship, is, that if it be not in so many words enjoined, it is undeniably implied in many scriptural injunctions; in examples and forms of prayer; in threatenings and promises. Every call to prayer, of which there are so many in the sacred Scriptures, such as "pray without ceasing;" "continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving;" "with all supplication in the Spirit, watching thereunto with perseverance and supplication for all saints; is in fact addressed to families, societies, and churches, as well as to individuals; and this must be granted, unless it were meant to assert, that prayer ought *only* to be individual, and that there is no such thing as united social prayer. In short, if a family is at *any time* to be convened for prayer, the exhortation to frequency, and to abounding in the exercise, applies to it in a social and family, as well as in an individual capacity.

Farther, the prayer our Lord taught his disciples, running in the plural, "*Our Father*," and the petition, "Give us this day *our daily bread*," being plainly adapted for social, and particularly for *family use*, and *that daily*—all the other blessings asked, being equally suitable for every day use, affords a very strong argument for family prayer. And again, the "*showing forth* the loving-kindness of the Lord every morning, and his faithfulness every night," pronounced to be a good thing, (Ps. xcii. 2,) seems very plainly to refer to the morning and the evening sacrifices of the family altar. And the promise of our Lord, that "wherever two or three are met together in his name, he will be present," surely applies to the smallest meetings, such as a family, as well as to the greater assembly of his people. These are attractive passages, bearing on the subject, and should sweetly and cordially unite the members of families in one song of praise, and in fervent joint supplications at the throne of that God of whom the whole family in heaven and earth are named. We must, in faithfulness, bring forward also the reverse of this pleasing picture, and call upon you to mark well the threatening contained in Jer. x. 25, where it is said, "The Lord will pour out his fury upon the heathen that know him not, and upon the *families* that call not on his name." Will it be said, this passage applies to heathen idolaters, and not to those who know and acknowledge the true God? Surely, my dear friends, this will not screen *you* who have the true religion in your Bibles, and in your creed, but who have no admittance for the worship of the true God in a domestic and social capacity. The heathen may well rise up in judgment against *you*, lukewarm professing Christians, who have no household worship, while *they* have their *Lares* and *Penates*—their gods of the house and the hearth—against you who have every other social enjoyment, and who regularly meet to eat and drink together, but seldom or never to worship God. But unwilling to end any one part of this address with threatening—desiring to allure you to that which is at once duty and privilege, I would remind you of the "dwellings of the righteous, wherein is heard the melody of joy and health, and of the delightful description of Malachi, the last of the Old Testament prophets, who thus writes, "Then they that feared the Lord, spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened and heard it; and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord and that thought upon his name: and they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him." (Malachi iii. 16, 17.)

My third argument is, that the examples approved in Scripture, have the force of law. Whatever is sanctioned by the general practice of religious characters, we cannot err in following, nay, we are not safe in neglecting. Consult the records of ancient times, and you will find that the practice of the saints has been uniform in attending to family religion. The account of individual believers is often short, and only a small part of what they did in the service of God is recorded; yet, in regard to many of them, this is particularly specified. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had

their domestic altar, and called upon the name of the Lord. This is as certain as that they were believers, and heirs of the promise, that in their seed the *families* of the earth should be blessed. A *patriarch* without his family altar would have been a contradiction. The heathen might well have said, "where is *your God*?" Jacob affords a most instructive example at once of family worship, and family reform, and discipline, as recorded in Gen. xxxv. "Put away the strange gods which are among you, and 'arise and let us go up to Bethel, and I will make there an altar unto God, who answered me in the day of my distress, and was with me in the way which I went.'" Next let me bring to your remembrance, the bright example of the noble-minded, patriotic, decided, and single-hearted Joshua, who, on the plain of Shechem, near the close of his bright career—like the planet reflecting a more pure and brilliant radiance, when drawing nearer the sun and fountain of light, as with his departing breath, he declared an adherence to his long-before firmly-founded resolution, "whatever others do, as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD." (Josh. xxiv. 15.) But time would fail to tell of Abel, of Noah, of Job, of David, of Daniel, of Cornelius, a centurion, of the converted jailor at Philippi, who rejoiced, believing in God *with all his house*; and of Aquila, and Nymphas, and Philemon, who had each a church in his house. The Apostle Paul, that bright example of Christianity, can it for a moment be questioned whether he practised family worship, when we find him sending salutations to those Christians I have just mentioned, and to the churches in their houses; when we observe the remarkably devotional strain of his writings; when we find him exhorting to "let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs," &c. (Col. iii. 16;) when we read that *he* and *Silas* prayed and sung praises together in the prison at Philippi; and that before parting with his friends, he kneeled down with them on the sea-shore and prayed: and in the Epistle to the Ephesians, speaks of making mention of them daily in prayer, and of bowing the knee to "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named?" &c. Eph. iii. 14, 18.

Have we not, moreover, the example of our *Lord and Saviour*, presiding among his disciples as a father in his family, and a master among his domestics, and a teacher among his scholars, in the offices of devotion, as well as in pouring instruction into their ears and hearts, and after the passover and the breaking of bread, singing a hymn before they went out to the Mount of Olives?

When we continue to trace the history of the Church after the canon of revelation is closed, we find the same principles producing similar effects; and religion, wherever it had a being, and in any measure of life and power, occupying first the heart and closet, next the family and household, subordinating the *head* and *members* to the worship and obedience of the living and true God. In every age of the Church, religious parents have been characterized by their care in bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; nor has it ever been with them a matter of doubt, whether they ought to worship God with their families. Some may

have never justified the neglect, or been satisfied in it, but have at length conquered all obstacles, and have sought and obtained grace to be faithful, and having once *tried*, they have never abandoned the practice. And, wherever religion prospers or revives, the prevalence of family worship has been always one of its certain and constant attendants; and on the other hand, where there is little of this godly practice, there is also little fear of God—little religious knowledge—little value for the gospel—little of the life and practice of godliness. In one word, in all ages, personal and family religion have been united, and have declined or flourished together. They who find a place for the Lord in their hearts, will not give sleep to their eyes, nor slumber to their eyelids, till they find a habitation for the mighty God of Jacob in their dwelling. The same person who resolves to “sing of mercy and of judgment,” at the same time resolves, “I will walk within my house with a perfect heart. O when wilt thou come unto me.” (Ps. ci.)

ART. XII.—*Closing Scene of John Calvin, as related by Beza.*

HAVING made his will, Calvin sent to inform the four syndics, and all the senators, that he wished once more before he departed this life, to address them in the senate-room, whither he hoped to be carried the following day. The senators answered, they would rather come to him, and requested him to have a regard to his health. The next day they all repaired from the senate-room to the house of Calvin. After mutual salutations, and an apology on his part, because they had waited on him, when it was his duty to have visited them, he commenced by stating that he had for some time desired this interview, but deferred it until he felt more certainly assured of his dissolution. He then said, “I return you my warmest thanks, honoured lords, for conferring such great honours on me, who have done nothing to merit them, and for manifesting such forbearance towards my numerous infirmities, which I always considered the strongest proof of your uncommon kindness. Though in the discharge of my ministerial duty I have been engaged in various disputes, and have endured numerous insults, a necessary part of the trials even of the best characters, yet I know and acknowledge that none of these have befallen me from any fault of yours. I earnestly entreat you also, if I have not performed my duty in any instance as I ought, to ascribe it rather to want of ability, than to want of will to serve you. For I can testify with sincerity, that I have felt a deep and lively interest in the welfare of your republic; and, if I have not fully discharged all the duties of my station, I have certainly exerted myself to the utmost in promoting the public welfare.

“Were I not to acknowledge that the Lord has sometimes on his part condescended to grant that my services have not been altogether without advantage to you, I should justly deserve to be charged with dissimulation. But I again earnestly entreat your pardon for having performed so little either in my private or public capacity, in comparison with what I ought to have done. I certainly grant

with the greatest readiness, that I am very much indebted to you on account of your patience in enduring that vehemence of mine, which has sometimes been immoderate. I trust God himself has pardoned all these my sins.*

"Touching the doctrine you have heard from me, I testify that I have not taught the word of God intrusted to me in a rash and uncertain manner, but with purity and sincerity. Had I acted otherwise, I should have been as fully assured of God's anger, already impending over my head, as I now feel confident that my labours in teaching have not been displeasing to him. And I testify this before God, and in your presence, so much the more willingly, because I cannot doubt that Satan, after his usual manner, will raise up wicked, vain, light-minded, ambitious men, to corrupt the sound doctrine which you have heard from me as the servant of God."

Then passing to those immense benefits which they had received from the Lord, he said, "I am the person who can best testify from how many and great dangers the hand of the Lord hath delivered you. You see, moreover, in what circumstances you are placed. Whether in prosperity or adversity, keep this truth, I beseech you, constantly before your eyes,—that it is God alone who can give stability to kingdoms and states, and on this account it is his pleasure to be worshipped by mortal men. Remember it was the testimony of the illustrious David, that he fell when he enjoyed profound peace; from which he never would have arisen, had not the Lord, with singular favour, stretched out his own hand to his relief. What then may the lot be of such little weak mortals, when this prince, distinguished for power and fortitude, experienced such a fall! It requires, therefore, great humility of mind, that you may walk with care and great fear of God, relying on his defence alone. You will thus be assured of the continuance of the same protection which you have hitherto so often in reality experienced, and may proceed with stability under his aid, even when your safety and security may, as it were, hang suspended from a slender thread. If your affairs are prosperous, be careful, I request you, not to exalt yourselves, like the profane; but rather, with deep submission of mind, return thanks to God for all your blessings. If your affairs are adverse, and death, therefore, surrounds you on all sides, still trust in him who raises up even the dead. Nay, consider on such an occasion with the greatest earnestness, that God is in this manner awakening you from sloth, that you may learn more fully to look to him alone with entire confidence.

"If you would preserve this republic in security, see to it with unremitting care, that the sacred seat of authority, in which God hath placed you, be not defiled with the pollution of sin; for he is

* Here is the humble and candid confession of a Christian. Calvin was a man of ardent feelings, and they may at times have betrayed him into angry and hasty expressions. And "amidst the incessant and violent attacks which he received, and the uninterrupted warfare which he had to carry on with the advocates of error, he must have been more than mortal, if he had never spoken hastily or harshly. But a few incidental actions, contrary to a man's general conduct, do not constitute character: and after every thing of this kind which can be mustered, it will still be true that, *characteristically*, Calvin was not a traducer or calumniator, but the possessor of a meek spirit, a governed tongue, and a guarded pen. He must, on the whole, be ranked not only among the greatest but the best of men."—*Rees' New Encyclop. Am. Ed.*

the only sovereign God, King of kings, and Lord of lords, who will honour those that honour him; but on the other hand, will cast down, and cover with disgrace,* those by whom he is despised. Worship him, therefore, according to his precepts, and let your minds be more and more intensely directed to the obeying of his will, for we are always at a very great distance from the performance of our duty. I know the temper and manner of you all, and am aware of your needing exhortation. There is none, even of those who excel, without many imperfections; and let each in this case examine himself with care, and ask of the Lord the supply of his known deficiencies.

"We see what vices reign in the greatest number of the assemblies convened in the world. Some, cold and indifferent to the public interest, pursue with eagerness their own private emoluments; others, are only intent upon the gratification of their own passions; some make a bad use of the distinguished talents bestowed upon them by God; while others are vain-glorious, and confidently demand that the rest of their fellow-counsellors should sanction their opinions.

"I admonish the aged not to envy such young persons as they find to be endowed by God with particular gifts; and I warn younger persons to conduct themselves with modesty, and to avoid all presumption. Let there be no interruption of one another in the performance of your duties. Shun animosities, and all that acrimony which has diverted so many from a proper line of conduct in the discharge of their office. You will avoid these evils, if each of you confines himself within his proper sphere, and all perform with fidelity the part intrusted to them by the state. In civil trials, I beseech you to avoid all favour, or enmity; use no crooked arts to pervert justice; let none, by any plausible address of his own, prevent the laws from having their due effect; nor depart from equity and goodness. If the evil passions excite temptation in any one, let him resist them with firmness, and look to Him by whom he has been placed on the seat of judgment, and ask the same God for the guidance of his Holy Spirit.

"Finally, I beseech you to pardon all my infirmities, which I acknowledge and confess before God, and his angels, and in your presence also, my honourable lords."

Having finished his discourse, he offered up a prayer to the Almighty and most merciful God, to shower down upon them, in still greater abundance, his best gifts, and by his Holy Spirit to direct all their consultations to the welfare of the whole republic. He then gave his right hand to each separately, and bade them adieu. All the senators departed in tears, manifesting deep sorrow, as if it was their last interview with a common father.

Calvin addressed all of us ministers under the jurisdiction of Geneva, who were assembled in his chamber, and at his request, on the 28th of April, in the following terms:—"Stand ye fast, my brethren, after my decease, in the work which you have begun, and be not discouraged, for the Lord will preserve this church and republic against the threats of its enemies. Let all divisions be removed far from you, and embrace one another with mutual charity. Consider on all occasions what you owe to the church in which the

Lord hath stationed you, and let nothing draw you from it. It will indeed be easy for such as are wearied of their flocks to find means for escaping from their duty by intrigue, but they will learn by experience that the Lord cannot be deceived.

"On my first arrival in this city, the gospel was indeed preached, but every thing was in the greatest confusion, as if Christianity consisted in nothing else than the overturning of images. Not a few wicked men arose in the church, from whom I suffered many great indignities; but the Lord our God himself so strengthened me, and banished all fear even from my mind, who am by no means distinguished for natural courage (I state the real fact,) that I was enabled to resist all their attempts. I returned hither from Strasbourg, in obedience to a call, against my inclination; because I thought it would not be productive of any advantage. I knew not what the Lord had determined, and my situation was full of very many, and very great difficulties. But proceeding in this work, I perceived at length that the Lord had in reality blessed my labours. Do you, therefore, brethren, persist in your vocation; preserve the established order; use at the same time every exertion to retain the people in obedience to the doctrine delivered, for there are yet among you some wicked and stubborn characters. Affairs, as you see, are not now in an unsettled state, on which account you will be more criminal before God, if they are subverted by your inactivity. I declare, my brethren, that I have lived united with you in the strictest bonds of true and sincere affection, and I now take my leave of you with the same feelings. If you have at any time found me too peevish under my disease, I entreat your forgiveness, and I return you my warmest thanks, because during my confinement you have discharged the burden of the duties assigned me."

After this address he reached out his right hand to each of us, and we then took leave of him with hearts overwhelmed with sorrow and grief, and eyes flowing with tears.

On the 2d of May, having been informed by Farel, in a letter, that he was determined, though now eighty years old, and in a state of health rendered infirm by age, to come and see him from Neufchatel, for Viret's residence was at a yet greater distance, he thus answered him in Latin:—

"Farewell, my best and most faithful brother! and since God is pleased you should survive me in this world, live mindful of our friendship, which has been of service to the church of God, and whose fruits we shall enjoy in heaven. Do not expose yourself to fatigue on my account. I respire with difficulty, and continually expect to draw my last breath. It is sufficient happiness for me that I live and die in Christ, who is gain to his people in life and death. Again farewell, with the brethren.—Geneva, 2d May, 1564."

The good old man, however, came to Geneva, and after they had enjoyed an interview with each other, he returned the next day to Neufchatel.

Calvin spent the remainder of his days, until death, in almost constant prayer. His voice, indeed, was interrupted by the difficulty of respiration; but his eyes, which retained their brilliancy to the last, uplifted to heaven, and his serene countenance, were certain proofs of the fervour of his devotion, and of his trust and confidence

in God. He often in his prayers repeated the words of David, "Lord, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it;" and at times those of Hezekiah, "I did mourn like a dove." Once, also, I heard him say, "Thou, Lord, bruise me, but I am abundantly satisfied, since it is thy hand." His doors must have stood open day and night, if all had been admitted, who, from sentiments of duty were desirous to see him; but, as he could not, from difficulty in speaking, direct his discourse to them, he requested they would rather pray for him, than be solicitous about paying their visits. Often, also, though I always found him glad to receive me, he was very scrupulous respecting the least interruptions thus given to the duties of my office, so sparing was he of the time which he knew ought to be spent in the service of the church; and his conscientious feelings, lest he should give the smallest trouble to his friends, exceeded the bounds of moderation. Such was the manner of comforting both himself and friends until the 19th of May, when we ministers were accustomed to meet relative to the censure of morals, and to take a friendly meal together, two days before Whitsuntide, and the celebration of the Lord's supper. He expressed a wish that the common supper, should on this day be prepared at his house, and rallying his little strength that remained, was carried from his bed to the adjoining chamber, when he said, "I come to see you, my brethren, for the last time, never more to sit down with you at table." Such was the commencement of one of the most melancholy repasts we ever took. He then offered up a prayer, took a small portion of food, and discoursed with us at supper, in as cheerful a manner as his weakness permitted. Before supper was fully finished, he ordered himself to be carried back to the adjoining chamber, and addressing the company with a distinctly smiling countenance, said, "This intervening wall will not prevent me from being present with you in spirit, though absent in body." His prediction was fulfilled, for from this day he always lay in a horizontal posture, his small body, except his countenance, which was very little changed, being so much emaciated, that breath only remained. On the 27th of May, the day of his death, he appeared stronger, and spoke with less difficulty; but this was the last effort of nature, for about eight o'clock in the evening, certain symptoms of dissolution suddenly manifested themselves. When one of his domestics brought one of the brethren, and me, who had only just left him, this intelligence, I returned immediately with all speed, and found he had died in so very tranquil a manner, that without his feet and hands being in any respect discomposed, or his breathing increased, his senses, judgment, and in some measure his voice, remaining entire to his very last gasp, he appeared more to resemble one in a state of sleep than death.

Thus this splendid light of the reformation was taken from us with the setting sun. During that night, and the following day, great lamentation prevailed throughout the city, for the republic regretted the want of one of its wisest citizens, the church deplored the death of its faithful pastor, the college sorrowed for such an incomparable professor, and all grieved for the loss of a common parent and comforter bestowed upon them by God himself. Many of the citizens were desirous to see him after he was dead, and could with difficulty be torn from his remains. Some strangers, also, who

had come from a distance with a view to see and hear him, among whom was the very distinguished English ambassador to the French court, were very desirous to see only the body of the deceased. At first, indeed, they were admitted; but afterwards, because the curiosity was excessive, and it was necessary to silence the calumnies of enemies, his friends considered the best plan would be to close the coffin next morning, being the Lord's day; his corpse, as usual, having been wrapped in a linen cloth. At two o'clock in the afternoon on Sunday, his body was carried to the common burying-place called Plein Palais, without extraordinary pomp. His funeral, however, was attended by the members of the senate, the pastors, all the professors of the college, and a great proportion of the citizens. The abundance of tears shed on this occasion afforded the strongest evidence of the sense which they entertained of their loss. According to his own directions, no hillock, no monument was erected to his memory, on which account I wrote the following epitaph:—

Why in this humble and unnoticed tomb
Is Calvin laid—the dread of falling Rome,
Mourn'd by the good, and by the wicked fear'd,
By all who knew his excellence revered;
From whom ev'n virtue's self might virtue learn,
And young and old its value may discern?
'Twas modesty, his constant friend on earth,
That laid this stone, unsculptured with a name;
Oh! happy turf, enrich'd with Calvin's worth,
More lasting far than marble is thy fame!

ART. XIII.—*American Oxfordism.*

[The following is from the *Catholic Herald*, the periodical of the Roman Church, published at Philadelphia:]

So many strange confessions of faith have appeared of late, among some reverend writers in the Anglo-American Church, that we are inclined to think some *new light* has broken in upon their, till now, darkened intellects. We find, generally speaking, that our New York contemporary, the *Churchman*, inclines strongly to encourage the onward march of looking for the "old paths." We say, generally speaking, for he has not, as yet, given a helping hand to the *bold efforts* of the pastor of St. John's Church, Brooklyn. The Pastoral Letter appeared through his columns, and though, as our readers have seen, it contains doctrines "passing strange," from a Protestant pastor, yet no notice, either laudatory or condemnatory, was taken of it. We are disposed to think, that the doctrines of Rev. Mr. Johnson are not *un-Churchman*, though it may not appear precisely prudent to speak out yet. We must wait till we know what the Ordinary thinks,—one little step or so more, and we will have to defend the author of the "*Pastoral*" ourselves; of others, our contemporary speaks more plainly. In his notice, on the publication of Dr. Onderdonk's sermon, to which we alluded last week, he says:

"But we have another and more particular reason for publishing this discourse at the present time, and that is, because it harmonizes so well with 'The Tracts for the Times,' in its doctrine of the Sacraments. It has been lately remarked by a clergyman of our Church, in a letter which first appeared in the *British Magazine*, and was thence transferred to our columns, that the exhibition of doctrines which were current among us twelve years ago, would now subject a man to be classed with Mr. Newman, Dr. Pusey, and Dr. Hook. Without offering an opinion as to the correctness of this observation, it may be safely said that the present discourse, which was well received ten years ago, contains as much 'Popery' as any of our Church journalists have yet brought to light in the 'Tracts.'"

ART. XIV.—*The Diocese of New York.*

MR. EDITOR:—I have had the opportunity of reading the address delivered by Bishop Onderdonk, of the Episcopal Church, at the opening of the Annual Con-

vention of the diocese of the state of New York. This customary document is the annual report of his official acts made by the bishop to each convention. It is rather diffuse, but a few of the facts which are given as proofs of the prosperity of the "church," may be edifying to your readers, and I give them without unnecessary comment.

1. As an evidence of "the progress of true Protestant feeling," we are informed that one or more churches have during the year placed *crosses* on their spires.

2. As proofs of an increasing "reversion to the ancient gospel model," it is stated that in one church the communion table, here called "the altar," "holds its proper distinguished station," by which the people are reminded of "the leading object of their assemblies," to wit, the Lord's supper.

3. As farther evidence of "the progress of correct sentiments," we learn that in another church "the altar, desk, and pulpit, are arranged on sound Christian principles." That is—not according to the degenerate method, sometimes practised, of giving the pulpit the chief prominence, but according to "the truly Christian view of the subject" placing "the altar as the most important place in the church, and the desk and pulpit as subsidiaries to it."

4. "But one church has made an attainment in which it seems to stand alone: in the rest there has been "a wide departure from the positive order of the church," which is lamentable. Are your readers impatient to know what this is? Let the bishop end their suspense—"I mean the providing of the chancel with a side table, on which the elements for the eucharist are placed, before their removal, by the priest, to the Lord's table."—*Presbyterian*.

ART. XV.—*Dr. McCrie's View of Discipline.*

"Evangelical and vital religion cannot flourish generally or permanently in any church, where discipline, in its scriptural purity and primitive vigour, is neglected. Discipline is to the Church of Christ, what a wall is to a city when an enemy has taken the field. It serves the same purpose that a fence does to a garden; if it be broken down, or suffered to fall into disrepair, the boar from the forest, and the wild beast of the field, will enter and devour all that is beautiful or productive within. This is a subject which ought to come home with peculiar force to the consciences and feelings of all Christians dwelling in this favoured land. As marks of the true Church, the reformers on the continent specified the pure preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments; but in addition to these, our reformers of Scotland, in their first Confession of Faith, described "discipline, executed according to the word of God, as a certain and infallible sign of a true Church." The establishment of a scriptural and efficient discipline in the Church of Scotland at the very beginning of the reformation, was her distinguishing glory, on account of which she was lauded and felicitated by foreigners, who desired to possess that blessing, but could not obtain it. As the want of this ordinance of the Church's Head has produced the most mournful consequences abroad, so to the neglect or perversion of it at home may be ascribed, in a high degree, those corruptions as to faith, worship, and morals, which have spread among ourselves, and which, more than once, have threatened to lay waste all our pleasant things. "Purity of doctrine and discipline," says one of our religious patriots, who "stood in the gap" at a critical period of our ecclesiastical history, "are like the twin sisters of Hippocrates, who always sickened and recovered at the same time, and at last dwindled and died together."

ART. XVI.—*Religious Excitement at a Native Festival.*

The Hindoos annually celebrate a festival called the Dhurmarajah Festival, in honour of the goddess Darobathe, who, to prove her innocence of a crime laid to her charge, had to pass through the fire, and came uninjured from it. Several engage themselves to pass through the fire, and this they perform very expeditiously. When the ceremony was last about to take place, a respectable and intelligent native, who had read many of our books, and possesses a considerable knowledge of divine things, took upon himself, in the presence of the assembled multitude, to speak to, and to endeavour, as far as the force of argument would go, to persuade his fellow-countrymen to desist from this cruel ceremony. As soon as his intention was known, those who were personally interested became enraged, and threatened that if he did not go away, they would make him feel the weight of their anger; he did not appear to be intimidated, but dauntlessly told them to bring out the image of the goddess on whose account, and to obtain whose favour and special protection, they were about to pass through the fire, "Which, for my part," said he, "I consider to be not only a very foolish and unnecessary performance, but cruelly

is also combined with it. Let the goddess be put into the fire first; and if she is not burnt, I promise readily to go into the fire with you." Instead of acceding to this fair proposal, they began to cry out, "Punish him, let him be punished for his daring presumption. He has been taught by the Padre and his people to speak against our gods and the worship we pay to them. He is become a Christian." The confusion which took place increased to such a degree, that it was feared some distressing scene would occur; but the man who had occasioned this uproar was obliged to make his escape.

The above-mentioned affair happened on a Sunday. It has produced no small stir among the people, and has excited a good deal of angry feeling in the minds of those who are interested, and who derive a good deal of emolument, honour, and praise from the observance of this cruel ceremony of passing through the fire. Many consultations were held, as to the best method of putting a stop to the progress of the gospel, which, in their estimation, appeared to be an alarming and growing evil, and if not put down soon, that it would spread to such a degree, that nothing would be able to withstand or arrest the influence of Christianity among the people. This, I think, at present, may well be compared to the little cloud which the servant of Elijah saw rising out of the sea, like a man's hand, the forerunner of the desired and expected blessing in that day when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

ART. XVII.—*Voluntary Associations.*

THERE appears to be some difference of opinion among our readers respecting the scriptural warrant for Voluntary Associations, and several intimations have been made to us, that something on the subject, in the pages of the Monitor, would be well received. We have accordingly given the views of *A Western Citizen*, in the present number. He treats the subject dispassionately, and those who entertain different views, can, if they think proper, reply to his arguments.

It is not believed that difference of views on this subject can produce any alienation of fraternal feeling among brethren, as it is a subject not directly embraced in our subordinate standards, and is consequently left open to the discretion and Christian liberty of all our members. If we had any evidence to apprehend that it could by any possibility lead to division, it should not be named by us. Controversies, properly so called, respecting such things as are not terms of communion should be avoided; but a discussion of such questions in a becoming manner is lawful, and may add something to our stock of useful knowledge, and exert a happy influence on our Christian deportment.

With such views, we venture to throw out the following hints, which may be of some assistance, by way of leading us to profitable reflection on the subject.

It is supposed that all associations of men may be divided into three classes:

1. Such as are of divine appointment, with which it is the duty of all men to associate themselves. To this class belong civil government and ecclesiastical associations legally organized under their respective constitutions, and each discharging their appropriate functions.

2. Such as are left to human discretion, with which men may or may not associate themselves, according to circumstances, or con-

victions of duty. Under this class we would rank the association spoken of by a "Western Citizen," and all others, whose design is to raise money for charitable or religious purposes, or for any other laudable object.

3. Such as are *contrary* to the divine law. Of this class the society of freemasons, odd fellows, theatrical associations, jockey clubs, and all associations for the public conveyance of passengers or merchandise on the Sabbath, may be mentioned as specimens.

If this classification be correct, then the only debatable ground remaining, will be in reference to those associations which are formed with the avowed design of correcting some existing abuse in church or state, or both, or of performing some duty which appropriately belongs to those institutions, but which they have neglected. Such associations propose to effect a reformation by the moral influence they appear to think themselves capable of exerting over the public mind. Nor do repeated and signal failures appear to dishearten them in the least. If their principles are sanctioned by divine authority, the question naturally arises, ought not the means they use for the dissemination of those principles to be sanctioned by the same authority?

It is believed to be a sound principle, that in all cases where God has appointed means in his word, either for the temporal or spiritual good of men, that appointment contains in it a prohibition of all other means. This is a principle lying at the foundation of protestantism, and is uniformly urged against the papists. It is the principle on which we condemn all innovations in the worship of God, not prohibited in so many words. Let this principle be applied to the question in hand.

God has appointed civil government, (Rom. xiii. 1—7,) for the regulation of social intercourse, the preservation of natural rights, religious liberty, and the protection of persons and property. He has appointed religious ordinances, for the moral improvement and salvation of men, and ecclesiastical government, for the purity, protection, and preservation of his church. Consequently, if this principle be correct, then it will follow, that he has prohibited the use of all other means, for the attainment of any of those ends for which divine institutions have been ordained. And of course, the principle laid down by a "Western Citizen," "that where an accusation is brought against an individual or society, the burden of proof lies upon the accuser," has no place here. The objection is not in the nature of an accusation. We ask by what authority they exist? Where is their authority for voluntarily associating themselves to do those things which God has commissioned others to perform? The *onus probandi* then rests with them, not with the objector. The President of the United States may convene the le-

gislature on emergency, or issue his proclamation enjoining obedience to the laws, &c., but where is the society that may do this! or, if they should do it, who would regard them? It is not therefore correct, "that whatever is morally right for an individual to do, may be lawfully done by a society." But the converse of the proposition is true.

Nor is the delinquency of constituted authorities a sufficient argument for the formation of voluntary associations for the performance of *their* duties. It may be a sufficient cause for the people to depose them and place more faithful men in their room, especially in a country like ours, where the choice of these public functionaries vests in the people. Owing to this circumstance, the people are more directly involved in our national sins than those of any other country upon earth. Let us then labour to correct the abuses which men have connected with divine institutions, instead of resorting to our own unauthorized inventions.

But we have serious objections to that class of associations to which we refer, to which we have not yet seen a satisfactory answer. Take the anti-slavery society as an example.

1. They have not the power to accomplish the avowed end of their association either in church or state.

2. The formation of associations of this character unnecessarily calls into immediate and active opposition all the conflicting elements. Men will resist their measures who are not opposed to the end of their association, because they disturb other interests.

3. It is inconsistent for men to continue in the communion of any ecclesiastical body, that tolerates in its bosom any of those evils which they propose to remove, by means of voluntary associations. With the exception of the Associate Church, the Reformed Presbyterian, and a few Baptists in Vermont, every ecclesiastical body in the United States, tolerates slavery in its communion; and yet anti-slavery men can give the right hand of fellowship in Christian communion to such as are involved in this sin, then meet in voluntary associations, and give us eloquent speeches to influence public opinion against their own conduct! We have not the least doubt that a majority of the convention which met in Albany in August last belonged to this class of persons; but have not the means of knowing with certainty. Had these men pleaded with their mother for a condemnation of this sin, protested and appealed till they carried the question to the supreme judicatories of their respective churches, and in case of failure seceded, they would have commenced their work where all reformation must begin. The tree of slavery has put forth its roots deep into the bosom of the Christian church, and this is the soil which has given to it a luxuriant growth that overshadows the length and breadth of the land. And till

these roots be lopped off, men may search it in vain, for a single withered branch, or even a "sear and yellow leaf."

Such, then, are our views, briefly and somewhat crudely expressed; if erroneous, we should rejoice to be corrected, and shall therefore conclude by proposing the following query: Have we any warrant from the word of God, to form voluntary associations for the performance of social and moral duties which lie within the appropriate sphere of those civil and ecclesiastical institutions, that are of divine appointment?

ART. XVIII.—*Pious Sayings of Good Men.*

EVIL SPEAKING.—Perhaps no single cause contributes more to banish the Spirit of God from the houses and hearts of men than evil speaking. There are sins of more flagrant enormity, but what sin is more extensively diffused? Evil speaking! Who is without sin in this respect? How common it has become! How much of it there is every day—every where—in the city and in the country—at home and abroad—in every large concourse—and in every little company, and even in the solitude of the closet. Who is not among its actors and its objects? We sacrifice others on this cruel altar, and then we ourselves become its cruel victims. How easily we slide into this sin!

AFFLICTION.—The sweet perfume of many plants remains within them till they are bruised. The alabaster box of precious ointment did not fill the house with its pleasant savour till it was broken. So, it is not prosperity, but adversity, that brings out the loveliness of the Christian character. How much of the Saviour's glory would have been lost to the world, but for his afflictions. How shrunk and diminished would have appeared that prince of Apostles, Paul, had he encountered no peril nor trial in his earthly career! What beauty and glory now gild the martyrs of other days, and of our own! which had been unknown had they not gone through much tribulation. "Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament," says Lord Bacon, "adversity is the blessing of the New, which carrieth the greater benediction, and the clearer revelation of God's favour. Yet even in the Old Testament, if you listen to David's harp, you will hear as many hearse-like airs as carols; and the pencil of the Holy Ghost hath laboured more in describing the afflictions of Job than the felicities of Solomon."

He that would govern his actions by the laws of virtue, must regulate his thoughts by those of reason; he must keep guilt from the recesses of his heart, and remember that the pleasures of fancy, and the emotions of desire, are more dangerous as they are more hidden, since they escape the awe of observation, and operate equally in every situation, without the concurrence of external opportunities.—*Johnson.*

We should not be with wicked men as their companions, but physicians.—*Ib.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

WE have received a communication from a member of the Anti-Slavery Convention, which met at Albany in August last, who is "persuaded that we entirely misapprehended, and consequently, did injustice to the principles, the moral tone, and the spirit of that body." The only thing which prevents the insertion of this article entire, is want of room. That is, its insertion, together with the requisite reply, would occupy more room than ought to be given to a subject which however important in itself, can only be regarded as *incidental* to the main design of the RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

In reference to a statement made by us that out of four hundred delegates, only thirty-eight voted for the withdrawal of political support from pro-slavery men, he says, "the vote here referred to was as follows, *Ayes* 238, *Nays* 10, *declined voting* 8. The remaining delegates had returned home. So the vote was announced at the time it was taken, and as it was published in the *Emancipator*, where also the names of the voters and non-voters were all given." To this we reply, that our statement was taken from the *Emancipator* of August 15, 1839, p. 63, where it will be found recorded in the following words: "The main question being on the adoption of the first resolution, (the one in question) it was carried *Yeas*, 38, *Nays*, 10." It seems the true vote referred to by our correspondent was given in that paper of August 8th, which we never saw till after the receipt of the correction before us. This typographical error of the *Emancipator*, did indeed lead us into a misapprehension of the "moral tone" of the convention, which gave a turn to our remarks not altogether just towards that body, and our correspondent is entitled to thanks for the correction, which it is believed will be deemed satisfactory.

Respecting a communication from the Session of Cæsar's Creek, we respectfully suggest to our brethren of that session, that it would be more orderly to tell their *grievance* to the church than to the world. *Verbum sapienti*. If, however, any member of that session, or any other person in our communion, is desirous of discussing the abstract question of occasional hearing, and will write in the same spirit that characterizes the production of a *Ruling Elder*, on that subject, the Monitor is at his service.

It will be seen that our pages begin to display an unusual quantity of original matter. This is as it should be; and gives us great encouragement. Without underrating other productions, the reader's attention is directed to the article in the number for December entitled, "*Idolatrous Representations*," and in the present number to the articles entitled, "*Schismatics*," and "*How shall they preach, except they be sent?*" These papers are from different sources, on important subjects, and possess intrinsic excellencies, not the least of which is their brevity. May we not hope that a blessing will accompany the circulation of such essays among our people, and that some will good be accomplished?

"Symbolical language of scripture," and the article entitled "Salvation," in the next number.

Erratum—Page 362, 18th line from bottom, for "II." read I.

1.

De in Amdst.

CONTENTS.

	Page		Page
Schismatics,	361	An Incidental Argument against Im-	
Societyism,	366	mersion,	393
Farther Remarks on the Treatment		Essay on Family Worship,	393
of our Coloured Population,	369	Closing Scene of John Calvin, as re-	
Occasional Hearing. No. III.	377	lated by Beza,	397
Extracts from a Clergyman's Diary,	380	American Oxfordism,	402
Letter to the Editor from Rev. A.		The Diocese of New York,	402
Whyte,	382	Dr. M'Crie's View of Discipline,	403
Distinctive Names in Ecclesiastical		Religious Excitement at a Native	
Bodies,	384	Festival,	403
How shall they preach, except they		Voluntary Associations,	404
be sent?	386	Pious Sayings of Good Men,	407
Efforts of Calvin and Farel for the		Notice to Correspondents,	408
Maintenance of Discipline,	391		

AGENTS.—In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of good standing in the Associate Church, who are requested to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as special agents:

J. R. Weldin, 37 Market Street, Pitts-	Thomas Cummings, Putnam, Washing-
burgh, Pa.	ton Co., N. Y.
James Henry, Albany, N. Y.	James Wilson, Esq., Forks of Muddy
Peter McArthur, Cambridge, Washing-	Creek, York Co., Pa.
ton County, N. Y.	Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.
Alex. Gailey, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co. Pa.	James Hutchinson, Esq., New London
Wm. McMin, Potter's Mills, Centre	Cross Roads, Chester Co., Pa.
Co., Pa.	John Smith, Pittsburgh Village, Carroll
Thomas Beveridge, D. D., Canonsburgh,	Co., Indiana.
Pa.	R. G. Shannon, P. M., Columbus, Ran-
James Gordon, Peoria, Livingston Co.,	dolph Co., Ill.
N. Y.	Col. Wm. McVey, Cherry Forks, Adams
John Anderson, Huntingdon, Pa.	Co., Pa.

TERMS.—Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

The 15th volume, and some preceding volumes, can be supplied in numbers for \$1.00: bound, \$1.50.

Post Masters are respectfully requested to notify us of any discontinuance of the work sent to their office. The numbers need not be returned.

No subscription discontinued till arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the proprietors.

Money may be sent by mail at the risk and expense of the proprietors when five dollars or more is enclosed, provided the money is at par value in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, or Albany.

Letters and communications may be addressed either to Rev. C. Webster, 329, Pine Street, or William S. Young, 173, Race Street.

Just published, and for sale by William S. Young, No. 173, Race Street, Philadelphia.—The TESTIMONY of the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America,—printed by the direction of Synod. Price, in full sheep, three dollars per dozen: neatly half bound, two dollars and seventy-five cents. Retail, 30 cts. in sheep—25 cts. half bound.

Also, TUCKER ON PREDESTINATION; to which is appended DR. JAMISON'S ESSAY OF DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY. Price, five dollars per dozen, and 50 cents the single copy.